

VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

US
5321
47

The Present State of
Parties. 1856.

US 5321.47



Harvard College Library

FROM

Joel Parker,
Cambridge.

REFLECTIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

ON THE

PRESENT STATE OF PARTIES.

BY AN OLD CLAY WHIG.

NASHVILLE:
PRINTED BY G. C. TORBETT AND COMPANY.
1856.

REFLECTIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

ON THE

PRESENT STATE OF PARTIES.

BY AN OLD CLAY WHIG.

NASHVILLE:

PRINTED BY G. C. TORBETT AND COMPANY.
1856.

~~letter~~
US 5321. 47

1860, Mar. 5.
Capt of
Joel Parker, U. S. A.,
of
Cambridge.

CORRESPONDENCE.

NASHVILLE, MAY 13 1856.

GENTLEMEN: The undersigned have read with great pleasure the series of articles recently published in the UNION AND AMERICAN, under the title of "Reflections and Suggestions upon the Present State of Parties." These articles, by the terse and vigorous style of their composition, and the able, dignified, and candid manner in which the author handles the subject, have excited a very deep interest wherever they have been read. But, to the undersigned, their perusal has afforded peculiar gratification, because they embody sentiments to which they, as old Clay Whigs, heartily respond.

The undersigned regret the existence of the state of facts which rendered their publication in a Democratic newspaper a matter of necessity, since by reason thereof they have failed of that general circulation among old line Whigs, which is desirable. Such being the case, we write to request through you, gentlemen, that the author will consent to arrange them for publication in pamphlet form, for wider distribution, feeling assured that their general perusal will not only be highly gratifying, but productive of great good.

Very respectfully,

THOS. L. BRANSFORD,
DAN. A. JOHNSTON,
J. J. S. BILLINGS,
C. STONE,
THOS. HAYWOOD,
R. W. HAYWOOD,

Messrs. G. C. TORBETT & Co., Publishers UNION AND AMERICAN.

PREFACE.

In view of the publication in pamphlet form of the Series of Articles, entitled "Reflections and Suggestions on the Present State of Parties," by an "Old Clay Whig," which have been published in the columns of the *Union and American*, a few words of explanation are due both the writer and the public. The subjects discussed have been considered without any regular order or design, as they were not intended to be presented in any other shape than that in which they originally appeared.

The writer, being simply a private citizen, and not actively engaged in politics, was strongly disinclined to thrust his name before the public; nor does he consider that such a course would have been either necessary or proper.

If what he has written *be truths*, no name, however humble, should detract from their influence. If his statements and conclusions are founded *in error*, no name, however exalted, should entitle them to respect.

It may be proper, however, to state (for the reason that some persons have expressed a desire to be informed upon the subject,) that the writer is a native of Tennessee, and by birth and education, a Protestant. He was a devoted friend to HENRY CLAY, from his boyhood to the death of that distinguished leader of the Whig party. He has never cast his vote for but two members of the Democratic party during a period of about twenty years. His last vote as a Whig was for the Whig candidate for Governor in 1853. In the last election for Governor he abstained from voting, for reasons

which will readily suggest themselves to the minds of thousands of old Whigs, who, like himself, hoped, almost against hope, that something might occur, to again nationalize our old party, upon issues less repugnant to the broad and comprehensive principles of our government, than those presented by the American or Know-Nothing party.

Should there be any one connected with the press in Nashville, who desires any verification of the political antecedents of the writer, he refers them to the gentlemen who have, over their own signatures, desired the publication of the articles in question in pamphlet form.

Whatever may be the attitude of the writer towards other political parties, he claims no exemption from his portion of responsibility for "the obnoxious acts or violated pledges" of the Whig party, and will ever be willing to subscribe himself, without any apology or explanation,

"AN OLD CLAY WHIG."

REFLECTIONS AND SUGGESTIONS ON THE PRESENT STATE OF PARTIES.

CHAPTER I.

Old party divisions.—Present parties and their principles.—Great Britain in combination with the Abolitionists.—Malignity of the Black Republican Leaders.—Banks, the Speaker, and his opinions.—The Great Question of the Day.—The importance of a union of the whole South.—What course will Old Whigs pursue?

To a full understanding of the present state of parties, a very brief recurrence to those into which the country has been previously divided, is necessary. My purpose is rather to present an array of admitted facts, for the consideration of those who have occupied a position similar to my own in the past, than to make any labored argument in justification of my own conclusions. From the period of the presidency of MARTIN VAN BUREN to the advent of the Know-Nothing party, there were two national political parties—the Whig and Democratic, and a northern sectional faction, which, although in the excitement of party contests it may have been sometimes courted, was nevertheless thoroughly despised by both. These parties were divided upon measures and questions of policy, which are too well known to require that I should refer to them in detail. Upon the assembling of the present Congress, the great change which had taken place in the position of parties was made manifest in the election of their Speaker. There were three parties represented, to wit: The Know-Nothings, whose numerical strength was estimated at more than one hundred, and which was, therefore, the dominant party in the House; the Black Republicans, and Democrats. For the first time within the recollection of a majority of the citizens of the Union, the Whig party was not represented on the floor of Congress. The nomination of Mr. BANKS, the leader of the northern Know-Nothings, for Speaker, was attended by a fusion of the great body of that party north with the Black Republicans; and thus, for the first time in the history of the

country, an uncompromising Abolitionist was chosen to that high position. An analysis of the vote, by which he was elected, shows that out of one hundred and three votes received by him, about seventy were either of the Know-Nothing party, or owed their seats in Congress to that party. The southern Know-Nothings seceded from the main body of their party, and nominated an independent candidate. These three parties are now actively preparing for the approaching presidential campaign, under the following programme of principles, to wit:

The "Republicans," embracing that combination of northern Know-Nothings and Abolitionists, shadowed forth in the fusion for the election of Mr. BANKS—who are opposed to the admission into the Union of any more slave States—opposed to the Kansas-Nebraska bill, and in favor of excluding the southern States from the Territories by an act of Congress.

The American or Know-Nothing party, confined almost entirely to the southern States, by the secession of its northern allies—who are in favor of changing the naturalization laws, and are opposed to foreign-born citizens or Catholics holding offices in the government.

And the National Democratic party, which advocates the principles of the Kansas-Nebraska bill—the equality of the States—liberty of conscience in questions of religious faith—the right of the people under the constitution to elect whomsoever they please to fill all offices under the government; and the unrestricted liberty of the Territories to come into the Union, whenever they may lawfully do so, with whatever constitution the people may adopt, provided it is republican in form!

The Republican party, as its principles would indicate, is sectional, and embraces only the northern or free States of the Union. In its ramifications, however, it is connected with many anti-slavery associations in Europe, but more especially in Great Britain. It would be an error to suppose that this party embraced only the misguided fanatics, whose insane ravings have converted many of the churches in the north into mere political club rooms—subverting what were once regarded as the sanctuaries of the Almighty, where were taught the peaceful precepts of Christ, into unhallowed arenas, where madmen and traitors, preach murder and treason to madmen and traitors like themselves. These fanatics are the mere instruments and tools of designing men, whose purposes embrace a much wider scope than the mere enfranchisement of the slave. That a secret understanding subsists between the leaders of this party and men of high position in Great Britain, is undoubted. Occasionally the secret machinations of these conspirators are

brought to light—one incident of which is alluded to as follows, by a leading New York journal :

[From the New York Express.]

The *Belfast News Letter*, one of the oldest and most respectable journals of Ireland, makes public the following statement of its Liverpool correspondent :

“We are assured that Charles Sumner and Lord Carlisle have been in active correspondence on the slavery question. The league between the aristocracy of the old world, and the abolition disunionists of the United States is perfect.”

The Earl of Carlisle is Lord Lieutenant of Ireland—Charles Sumner is an abolitionist Senator of the United States from Massachusetts, and a kind of Drummond Light of the Black Republican faction.

This disclosure of the Belfast journal, is only a new evidence of the close and intimate alliance between the Black Republican Abolition party in the United States, and the aristocracy of Great Britain, which was already known to exist. It is not long since that the *London Daily News*, the oracle of the British anti-slavery society, declared right out that in the event of a war between England and the United States, it had the fullest assurance that the anti-slavery party here would be with Great Britain. Quite natural, all this ! What sympathy can the aristocracy of Great Britain have for the American Union, which was reared on the ruins of monarchy ? What love can their Abolition and Black Republican allies, on this side of the Atlantic, have for that same Union, which is held together by a constitution which they are in the habit of denouncing as an “atrocious bargain”—nay, the Union itself as a “League with Death, and a Covenant with Hell ?”

We may listen to the mad ravings of fanatics in the churches, and in the public assemblages in the North, with some degree of composure, but surely it is matter for serious consideration on the part of the South, when almost every day brings forth some new development of the combination of our old British foe, with this formidable party. As pertinent to this branch of the subject, I select a paragraph from a speech delivered by Mr. Giddings, of Ohio, in the Congress of the United States :

“Mr. Giddings said : I look forward to the day when I shall see a servile insurrection at the South. *When the black man, supplied with British bayonets, and commanded by British officers, shall wage a war of extermination against the whites—when the master shall see his dwelling in flames, and his hearthstone pollu-*

ted,—and though I may not mock at their calamity, and laugh when their fear cometh, yet I shall hail it as the dawn of a political millenium!!”

These malignant expressions of hatred, envy, malice, and depravity, are uttered in the halls of Congress, not by a despised leader of a contemptible faction, but by one of the most notable and influential members of the dominant party. The sentiments of GIDDINGS, we have every reason to believe, are the sentiments of that combination which placed Mr. BANKS in the Speaker's Chair of the House of Representatives—for previous to the election of Mr. BANKS he gave utterance to opinions scarcely less repugnant to decency and propriety, (although not exhibiting so great a degree of malignity,) notwithstanding which he was still upheld as the leader of Black Republicanism.

The response of Mr. BANKS to the question as to which was the superior race, the white or the black, should not be regarded as an unpremeditated reply upon an unstudied subject; on the contrary, it evidenced much reflection and a thorough knowledge of its important bearing upon the real question at issue. The intelligent Abolitionist can not say, without stultifying himself, that the negro is the *equal* of the white race, either morally, physically, or intellectually: he is estopped from saying that he is *inferior*, because the most inveterate enemy to slavery, would, by this admission, be forced to allow that laws conferring equal rights, political and social, on a race on whom the Almighty had fixed the ineffable impress of inequality, could result in nothing but evil to both, and an irreparable injustice to that race upon which nature had stamped the seal of superiority. Mr. BANKS, therefore, evaded a direct response to the interrogatory, which, if answered truthfully, would destroy the whole fabric of Abolitionism, and pointed to a *future absorption of the inferior race, which would render a solution unnecessary.*

These are the principles and purposes of that party, as enunciated by its leaders, which now controls the popular branch of Congress. These are the ideas which have taken such deep hold upon the minds of the people of the North, that all previous party ties have been severed. Even the new, and for a time powerful, organization known as Americans or Know-Nothings, has been split in twain by the geographical line which divides the slave from the free States. The Southern Americans could not muster even a corporal's guard of their confederates to stand by them in the protracted struggle for the Speakership. If their eloquent appeals could have awakened a sympathetic feeling in the breasts of even three of their

Northern brethren, this disgrace to the nation, and humiliation to the South could never have been achieved: In vain did the Southern Americans say to them — "The distinctive principle of our party is that Americans shall rule America," and "our mission is to establish the Holy Protestant faith." Their response was—"We coincide with you in your opposition to foreigners and Catholics, but we have a stronger feeling of hostility to the South and her institutions."

There was a small, but noble and determined band of patriots from the Northern States, who, throughout that long contest for supremacy in the House of Representatives, stood unwaveringly by the South, and they are none the less entitled to be held in grateful remembrance by every party in the South, because they were all members of the Democratic party. All honor to those noble and gallant spirits, who, amid the faithlessness of so many, proved true to the constitution, and to the equal rights of the South!

Admitting, for the sake of argument, the improbable fact that the discordant elements of the American party could be consolidated in the Presidential election, and that they should thereby secure a party triumph, would it not, in effect, be the triumph of Black Republicanism? Would not the scenes of the present Congress be re-enacted in the next? What reason has the South to hope that the Black Republican-Know-Nothingism in the future, will differ from what it has been in the past? It matters not under what name Abolitionism may attain power; and the history of this struggle for the Speakership shows that Northern Republicanism and Northern Know-Nothingism upon this vital question are identical. It is clearly manifest to the most superficial observer, that Know-Nothingism can only be successful in that contest by securing the support of the party which elected Banks Speaker; and that, therefore, the success of that party would be as fatal to the South as would be the triumph of Black Republicanism itself.

In view of the undeniable truths herein presented, I submit to reflecting and patriotic Whigs, *whether they do not owe a duty to their country above and beyond their allegiance to party leaders?* Whether they should not bury all past political unkindness in a considerate regard for their country's welfare? The citadel of the Union is beleaguered by its foes—their batteries are planted upon the hill tops which overlook its defences—their mailed warriors are thundering at the gates—their black banners are waving in triumph upon the dome of the National Capitol—while we, who should be its defenders, are ingloriously wrangling among ourselves *as to the particu-*

lar form of sectarian faith we shall adopt on going forth to battle!!

What madness in old Whigs to hesitate, when, if they have eyes, they must see the danger! Our own party no longer exists, and cannot, therefore, throw itself in the breach. All the old questions which divided us have passed away — new issues have arisen, and upon the most vital of these we agree with our former adversary. The issue is upon us, and we could not, if we would, avoid it. Abolitionism is the great question of the day, which has absorbed all others. In the fervid, eloquent, and impassioned language of the NASHVILLE PATRIOT:

"It has become a great, live, earnest, practical question!! It is WRESTLING WITH THE GOVERNMENT FOR ITS VERY LIFE, AND IS A MOST DANGEROUS ANTAGONIST. Obsolete land distribution, bank, and tariff questions, may be eschewed and ignored, but a question which threatens the sacrifice of State and individual rights, not to speak of the millions of property, CANNOT BE IGNORED!!"

Every well informed, unprejudiced man, must see, and feel, and know, that the only security against Black Republican rule, will consist in a cordial union of the South with the national men of the North. However patriotic the American party in the South may be, the proceedings of the Northern Americans in the present Congress, and in their late convention at Philadelphia, where they declared that unless the slavery section was stricken from their platform, they could not carry a single State, proves that they cannot be trusted. The American party in the South may be potent for mischief by dividing us, but they have proven themselves powerless to save!

That the mass of the Southern Know-Nothings are sound upon the great question of Southern rights no doubt can be entertained. However much it may comport with the instincts of some professional politicians and newspaper editors, to pronounce all who differ with them as hypocrites, I cannot be tempted to do an injustice to others, with whom I may not agree, and whose patriotism is fully equal to my own. But it is to be apprehended that, in the contest which is approaching, they will, in their party zeal for Mr. Fillmore, endeavor to cheat themselves and the country into the belief that the danger to result to our institutions by the political supremacy of Black Republicanism, is not so imminent as has been supposed. Forgetful of the teachings of the past, and overlooking the portentous clouds which overhang our political horizon, they may attempt to excuse themselves for fomenting division in

the South, by declaring the danger to be too remote to occasion serious apprehension. But will the people suffer themselves to be beguiled by those who endeavor to lull them into a fatal repose, by the delusive cry of "Peace! peace!" "when there is no peace?"

Will the honest and patriotic old Whigs *prove deaf to the warning which is wafted upon every breeze from the capital of the Union*, where Black Republicanism rules triumphant, and turn aside from the path which duty invites them to follow?

CHAPTER II.

Where are old Whigs to go?—Nomination of Mr. Fillmore, a fraud upon the South—The Philadelphia Convention unsound on the Southern question—Views of the Black Republican organs—They expect Old Line Whigs to divide the South—Whigs should support the National Candidate.—Franklin Pierce's National Principles.

Where am I to go? Since the nomination of Messrs. FILLMORE and DONELSON by the American or Know-Nothing Convention at Philadelphia, this question has no doubt suggested itself to the minds of thousands of old line Whigs in the South, who are impressed with the conviction that their action may exercise a most potent, if not a controlling, influence in the decision of the great and absorbing question, upon which the fate of the Union may be said to be suspended.

Many old Whigs, through force of habit, have thus far followed the Know-Nothing leaders since the disruption of the Whig party, without entertaining any sympathy for the new principles they enunciated. Others have kept aloof altogether from party contests, preferring to await events which might indicate the path they should pursue.

A cloud seemed to hang over the future of our glorious Republic, and they preferred to wait until they could see "*day light ahead*" before attaching themselves to either of the parties, who were marshalling their forces for the next great struggle for the Presidency.

A careful analysis of the elements composing the late Know-Nothing Convention, must force the conclusion upon every unprejudiced mind, that the nomination of Mr. FILLMORE *was a deliberately preconcerted fraud upon the Southern people!*

This may seem paradoxical, taken in connection with the fact that of all the leaders of the Know-Nothing party Mr. FILLMORE was perhaps the most acceptable to the South; but let us consider the circumstances under which, and the men by whom, that nomination was effected.

Ever since the adoption of the famous 12th section, it has been apparent that the party North and South could never be made to harmonize without an unconditional surrender on the part of the South of all claim to a political equality with the North.

The great bulk of the Know-Nothing strength was in the North, and the Black Republican party itself was not more ultra in its hostility to the South, nor more indissolubly united upon that vital issue.

Upon this question they would make no concessions—they would listen to no compromises! Their bitterness against the South could only be satiated by her humiliation; and with this spirit, and with a determination to accomplish this purpose, the convention assembled.

Never before in any convention in this Union, purporting to be national, and which was at least composed of representatives from all sections of the country, has there been exhibited such a spirit of sectional bitterness as characterized its proceedings.

The 12th section, the only plank in their platform upon which the party could hope to stand in the South, was ruthlessly stricken down.

Black Republicanism, in the guise of Americanism, held undisputed sway, and with a coarseness of vituperation peculiar to that school of fanatical traitors, they reviled the South and her institutions with a bitterness more worthy the columns of an incendiary Abolition journal, than of a deliberative national convention.

Many of the Southern members denounced the convention as a band of traitors, and left the hall, followed by the jeers and hisses of the rampant Abolition majority. No course seemed left for the South, consistent with honor and self-respect, but an immediate secession from the party; and in fact, at this stage of the proceedings the party was regarded by all as virtually dissolved.

Every true Southern member, no doubt, felt that he had no other alternative left than to unite with the national Democratic party, in opposition to the fell spirit of aggression against the rights of the South, which was the pervading sentiment of the majority.

It is certain that this is the aspect in which it was regarded

by the Northern majority. A little calm reflection convinced those resolute but cool headed free-soilers that in driving off the Southern wing of their party, they forced them into a union with the national Democrats, and by this union would secure the triumph of the national party in the Presidential election.

How was this result to be avoided? A cordial union of the two sections was impossible, for they were hopelessly antagonistical upon the great issue involved in the Presidential contest. The North could present no candidate entertaining their views who could be tolerated by the South. It being, therefore, impossible for the vote of the two sections to be united upon the same candidate, the consideration next in importance was to prevent the Southern wing of the party from uniting with the national Democrats, by allowing them to select an acceptable man, upon whom they might unite all the elements of opposition to the Democratic party in the South.

The Southern delegates seized greedily upon the bait, and the nomination of Mr. FILLMORE, *in a convention, a majority of whom were notoriously opposed to him*, or any other candidate having the semblance of nationality, was the result.

It is apparent that the North allowed of his nomination with the deliberate intention of withholding from him its support, and of uniting with the Black Republicans in the support of another candidate, while they hoped to accomplish a permanent division in the Southern States, by attracting to Mr. FILLMORE the old line Southern Whigs.

Upon what other hypothesis can we account for the undeniable fact, that *a minority nominated a candidate against the known sentiment of a majority?* That a *majority* repudiating a certain principle should yet allow the *minority* to select a candidate favoring that principle, and upon that sole issue! We repeat then that the nomination of Mr. FILLMORE was a fraud upon the South, perpetrated deliberately, by a party which did not intend to support him, but with the sole view of preventing the union of the South against the aggressive spirit of the fanatics in the great struggle which is approaching.

As confirmatory of this view, we subjoin the following extracts from a leading article in the *New York Courier and Enquirer* of the 26th of March.

It must be borne in mind that this paper once strongly sympathized with the American movement, although now a leader in the Black Republican ranks:

[From the *New York Courier and Enquirer*.]

THE NEXT PRESIDENCY—DAYLIGHT AHEAD.—As the time approaches for marshalling the forces of different parties for the next Presidential campaign, the character of that struggle be-

comes more apparent, and the materials for judging of the probable result, more tangible. Two weeks ago, it was impossible, for any person, however great his political acumen, to form any reasonable conjecture as to the probable character of the next Presidential contest; but now, thanks to the friends of Mr. FILLMORE, the political horizon is becoming clear, and he who runs may read what is to be the character of the next Presidential contest.

The nomination of Mr. FILLMORE was an unexpected movement, and for some weeks at least threw all political calculations and combinations into the greatest confusion. The consequences nobody could foresee; but just in the ratio that it lost favor with the Know-Nothings of the North, the friends of the nomination sought to propitiate the Southern wing of the American party. And it is to this fact, that we are indebted for the clearing away of the political fog which obscured the future. Within a few days the friends of Mr. FILLMORE at Washington, have given the most emphatic assurances to the Southern Know-Nothings, that in the event of his election to the Presidency, *he will not, under any contingency, countenance or be a party to, any legislation which shall disturb that portion of the Kansas-Nebraska act which repeals the Missouri Compromise.* This declaration has been received in good faith by the Southern wing of the American party in Congress, and they have put it forth to their constituents in like good faith; and they now publicly proclaim, and have the best reason for believing, that on this platform—which is in fact, as much the Nebraska-Kansas platform as that which will be put forth by the democracy under the advisement of Mr. DOUGLAS—they can carry all, or nearly all, the Whig States of the South. And in this opinion we concur. With a pro-slavery platform, such as the friends of FILLMORE have pledged themselves to sustain and advocate, the Whig party, under a new name, are in position again in the Southern States, and without any other loss than that portion of them who shrewdly perceive that the carrying of a few Southern States will not elect Mr. FILLMORE President, and who, desiring to be with the majority, will, therefore, sustain the Democratic ticket.

With this assurance of support at the South, all prospect of Mr. FILLMORE's being withdrawn from the next contest necessarily ceases; and consequently, it becomes a matter of absolute certainty, that there will be three candidates in the field for the next Presidency, viz: The Democratic candidate, to be nominated at Cincinnati in June, upon the basis of the Kansas-Nebraska bill and the extension of slavery into the Territories;—MILLARD FILLMORE, nominated by the Know-Nothings, and

pledged to sustain the action of the Democracy in the repeal of the Missouri Compromise to the same extent as the Democracy itself ;—and the nominee of the Republican party.

The Democratic party will, of course, receive the support of all the members of that party, who approve of the repeal of the Missouri Compromise. Mr. Fillmore will, in like manner, receive the votes of all the Whigs who approve of that uncalled-for proceeding, and of the slavery agitation, and the Kansas outrages which necessarily followed. And the nominee of the Republican party will, of course, be cordially supported by every individual, no matter to what party he may have belonged heretofore, who is honestly opposed to the extension of slavery into free territory. * * * *

Such is the programme of the next Presidential campaign ; and we are free to confess, that we are most thankful to Mr. FILLMORE and his friends for having produced this result. *Of course, no body will vote for Mr. Fillmore, who would not in the existing state of affairs have voted for the Democratic instead of the Republican ticket ; and therefore, it necessarily follows, that the third party will draw votes only from the Democratic ticket.* The only question of principle involved in the next contest, is the extension of slavery by the direct legislation of Congress, into Territory now free through the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, made in good faith in 1820, and resistance to that act of bad faith.

The question has been asked—Who will be the candidate of the Republican party ? This is a question which no man can answer ; but it is manifest to us, that he will be one who is thoroughly identified with the great principle involved in the contest. If Mr. FILLMORE had not been placed in nomination, there might, and probably would have been, some trimming in this matter ; and claims would have been urged on the part of those who were least obnoxious to the advocates of slavery-extension. But not so now. The contest is narrowed down to a direct issue on a great and vital principle ; and our standard bearer will be him, who shall prove himself to be the ablest, the staunchest, and the most fearless advocate of that principle.

The above exhibits the exultant aspect in which the nomination of Mr. FILLMORE is regarded by the inveterate and unappeasable enemies of the South. The premises are correctly laid down, and the conclusions are irresistible.

To the old line Whigs of the South is assigned the inglorious part of securing the triumph of Black Republicanism, by the support of a candidate for the Presidency who has no earthly chance of an election, and the consequent withholding of their

support from the only party which can, by any possibility make head against the mad fanaticism of that large portion of Northern people who seem resolved, at all hazards, to accomplish the humiliation of the South, though at the expense of the Union itself.

Under this programme the old line Whigs of the South are to support Mr. FILLMORE. The national Democrats of the South are to support their candidate, while the *united phalanx of Northern Black Republicanism and American-Know-Nothingism* is to secure an easy victory over a divided foe!!

Already do we perceive in the North, the portentous signs of that fusion of all the elements of opposition to the South. In Congress they act in perfect harmony, and in their public assemblages they fraternize as men having a common purpose. Their pulpits even are desecrated by inflammatory and blood-thirsty harangues, counselling union and harmony in all the elements of Black Republicanism.

The nomination of Mr. FILLMORE has removed the dark clouds which obscured the sun of Black Republicanism; and they can now, for the first time; (says their organ, the *Courier and Enquirer*,) behold "day-light ahead!" But the glare of that bright sun-light has shed its rays also upon our path; and we, too, the *betrayed Whigs of the South*, can see "day-light ahead."

The old line Whigs of the South cannot fail to perceive that in the present state of affairs there is but one party that can save the country; and most anxiously do we hope that the national Democratic party, which assembles in June, will present for our support a tried man upon whom all national men may unite.

With such a man as FRANKLIN PIERCE, as the standard bearer of the national flag, the old line Whigs will rally with an enthusiasm scarcely surpassed in the brightest period of their political career. They know, from the past, that he can be trusted in the future. They have seen him bare his bosom to the storm of fanaticism and boldly proclaim equality of rights for the South, amid the execrations of our enemies. We have beheld him in every trying emergency of his administration, the unflinching upholder of civil and religious liberty, and the undaunted champion of our national honor.

We feel and know that the great whig heart of the nation will respond joyously to his nomination, or that of any other sound and tried champion of the Union and Constitution.

We feel that we speak the sentiment of the great conservative Whig party, when we say that they will obey their country's call in the hour of her greatest need, and that they will never consent to be the tools of the fanatical and traitorous enemies

of the Union. They will never consent to be the instruments of the humiliation of the South, and the degradation of her free-born sons, but they will throw the weight of their powerful influence to that great national party whose motto is every where the same—“*Equal laws, equal rights, and a faithful observance of the compromises of the Constitution.*”

CHAPTER III.

Two parties divide the country on the Slavery Question—The entire South oppose Abolitionism—United action of old line Whigs can defeat Black Republicanism—They should sacrifice personal predilections for the good of the country.—A few words to patriotic Know-Nothings.—The votes given to Mr. Fillmore may secure the success of the Abolitionists.

I have not yet discussed the distinctive principles of the American or Know-Nothing organization, because, independent of any objection which might be urged by old Whigs against the creed of this party, we could not agree, by supporting the candidates of that party, to create a diversion in the Southern States, in favor of the triumph of Black Republicanism.

Two great parties are arrayed against each other, *upon a direct and single issue, for the first time.* The one, the Black Republican party, entirely sectional in its organization, but formidable, in that it combines all the elements of opposition to slavery, and the equal rights of the Southern States.

The other, the great conservative National party, which maintains that all the people of the United States and the respective States, have equal rights in the Territories, which are the common property of the nation, and which were purchased by the common blood and treasure of the whole people.

No matter what our party predilections may be, whether Whig, Democratic, or American, we of the South profess to agree in our opposition to the Black Republican creed. We all perceive the gathering storm; we see the compact columns of the enemy in the distance. We know the feelings of hatred, envy and malice with which we are regarded by that fanatical, but cool, calculating and persevering enemy; and either of the parties South would crush them under its heel, if they could do so, and were allowed to dictate the manner in which it should be done; but still we do not, as we should, present an undivided front. There is now but little hope that we can be entirely

united in that contest. Mr. FILLMORE has been nominated, as we have shown heretofore, with the settled purpose to make that union in the South impossible.

A united action on the part of the old line Whigs, however, if properly directed, can secure the triumph of the National party in every State, south of Mason and Dixon's line, by an overwhelming majority. In withholding our support from Mr. FILLMORE, and transferring it to the National candidate, we are not doing violence to any principle which we have heretofore, as Whigs, professed. On the contrary, we are occupying the great national, conservative ground upon which we have always stood. We are now standing where our American friends left us, when they deserted, as it were, the faith of their fathers, and went off in pursuit of strange idols.

While we are deeply grieved at the apostacy of those leaders of the old Whig party who, wearied with long waiting for the spoils of power, and depressed by an overwhelming defeat, sought to rise upon a popular hobby on the ruins of our time-honored organization; and while we would have delighted to do them honor and to heap rewards upon them, when we had any to bestow, yet a higher duty impels us now to adhere to our old land marks, even to the sacrifice of any lingering attachment we might have entertained for those under whose leadership we have so often, in times past, engaged in political conflicts. That this is the sentiment of the thousands of old Clay Whigs, who have, since the advent of Know-Nothingism, kept aloof from all party contests, no doubt can be entertained; and that they will, in the approaching great struggle for the liberties of the South, give their hearty support to the National Democratic candidate, if he be a tried and true man, is no longer a question to be debated. Any other course would be inconsistent with all their antecedents, and with the faith which they have always professed, and with that conservatism which they always claimed to be the distinctive characteristic of their party. All the temporary questions of policy which divided the two great parties of the past have been disposed of, and are no longer subjects of discussion. There is now one great issue pending, and upon that we agree!

Thus far I have indicated the course of those only of the old Whig party who have not enlisted under the banner of Know-Nothingism. I will now briefly address myself to that portion of the old Whig party who, under what they considered patriotic impulses, have attached themselves to the so called American party.

When we regard calmly the political history of the past two years—when we look around us at the present moment, and

find the great and growing Abolition party of the North, under the name of Republicans, combining all the elements of sectional and fanatical hatred to the South, embracing within its serpent-folds the eminent, as well as the obscure, from all the old political organizations of the North—when we find that, of the assembled Representatives of the nation at Washington, with the exception of the small but noble band of National Democrats, the entire North, of all shades of political opinions, and without regard to previous differences, have joined the hand of fellowship under the banner of Black Republicanism—when we find that, throughout the entire North, the ministers of God's holy word have desecrated their pulpits and have belied their holy calling, by preaching a crusade of blood against the people of the South—can we doubt the declaration of the Black Republican organ from which we have quoted, that “*the contest for the next Presidency is narrowed down to a direct issue on a great and vital principle?*”

This being so, is it not the duty of all National men, and especially of the entire South, to unite in solid phalanx against the encroachments of this formidable combination?

Will Mr. FILLMORE receive the support of a solitary man, North or South, who would, if he were out of the way, vote the Black Republican ticket? And, on the other hand, is it not clear that all those who will bestow their suffrages upon Mr. FILLMORE, would, if he were not a candidate, vote with the National Democrats, against the Black Republicans?

The response of every true man in the American party would unhesitatingly be, that the supporters of Mr. FILLMORE would vote for the National Democrat, rather than the Black Republican.

It follows, then, that the entire vote of Mr. FILLMORE will be abstracted from the strength of the National party in that great struggle; and by whatever sophistry it may be attempted to gloss it over, the truth is irresistible that those who thus divide the National party, contribute to, and will be responsible for, the triumph of Black Republicanism.

This is a harsh conclusion; but we ask the honest and true Whigs of the old school, as well as the patriotic rank and file of the new party, whether that conclusion is not fairly deducible from undeniable premises?

CHAPTER IV.

Reply to the comments of the *Nashville Patriot*.—Reason for the publication of these articles in the *Union*.—Unpleasant to separate from old party associates.—The Know-Nothing different from the Whig party.—Know Nothing candidate for Vice President an old Democrat.—Prod' of the Abolitionism of the Philadelphia Convention.—Southern witnesses.—Mr. Fillmore's nomination a trick, to prevent union in the South.—Comments on the character of the Convention that nominated him.

There are some points in the comments of the *Nashville Patriot* on the communications which have appeared in the *Union and American*, from an "Old Clay Whig," to which I desire briefly to reply. I will premise what I have to say by admitting, to the full extent, the advantage under which I labor in being debarred the privilege of reaching those for whom these articles have been chiefly intended, through the columns of a Whig paper.

The *Patriot* taunts me with the misfortune which has befallen our old party, in not having an organ at Nashville, in the following ungenerous language:

"He (An Old Clay Whig) selects, as the medium of his communication with them, a journal, which for a longer term of years than many of his readers can number, has been a consistent and inveterate enemy to Whig men and Whig principles. If he be sincere in his attempt to reach their hearts, and convince their judgments, he certainly addresses them under disadvantage. * * * His selection of an organ, however well it may comport with his affinities, will, with true Whigs, injure his cause, and weaken his efforts in teaching them their duty."

The weakness and illiberality of this argument can only be appreciated by those who know that the *Union and American* is the only paper published in Nashville that would give place in its columns to the communications of Old Clay Whigs, who oppose Know-Nothingism.

The inference may, however, be drawn from the remarks of of the *Patriot* above quoted, that I would have been more liberally dealt with, by that paper, and that my communications would have been suffered to appear in their columns. If this be the true meaning, I will accept most thankfully the proffered indulgence, and will, in future, spare the feelings of the sensitive Editors, by publishing the honest reflections of an Old Clay Whig, in the *Patriot*, instead of the *Union and American*.

I am only an occasional reader of the *Patriot*, but I have not been unobservant of the distinguished ability with which

it has been conducted, nor of the manly and patriotic stand which it assumed and triumphantly maintained, in opposition to the trimming policy, which was advocated by many of its cotemporaries ; nor am I unmindful of the delicate sense of propriety evinced by the present Editors, when, upon assuming a political position in conflict with their previous advocacy of Whig principles, they dropped the name of "TRUE WHIG" and assumed another, by which that paper is at present known. I am fully aware, also, that in the *Patriot*, an Old Clay Whig has a skilful, accomplished, and able adversary ; yet, so fixed am I in the conviction of the general correctness of my positions, that I would not fear to submit to an enlightened public, even my plain, unvarnished statement, against its more polished and skilful rhetoric, if I could address myself to the same readers, and upon more equal terms.

The first comments of the *Patriot* upon the communications of "An Old Clay Whig," referring only to the supposed personal qualities of the writer, without touching upon the merits of the subject discussed, a reply was considered neither appropriate or necessary. I regard the declaration that the members of the American party derive a gratification from the refusal of "An Old Clay Whig" to unite with them in the support of the Presidential ticket, rather as a splenetic ebullition of ill-humor, than the expression of any actually existing feeling. I am well aware, from personal observation, that no party views *with satisfaction* the opposition of any quiet, unobtrusive citizen, however humble or obscure may be his position.

If this statement of the *Patriot* be true, however, I must frankly admit that the feeling has not been reciprocated. My associations, personal and political have been for so many years identified with Whigs and the Whig party, that I have regarded with painful emotions, the approach of that crisis in our political history which might produce an estrangement ; not that political differences of opinion, *necessarily* affect our private friendships, but I know from personal observation, that such results sometimes follow. As for myself, my way of life is almost "fallen into the sear, the yellow leaf," and I well know, that there would be more quiet, and perhaps a greater degree of personal comfort, in floating on upon the current which bears a majority of those with whom I have been previously associated by so many and such strong ties. But in a Republic like ours, each citizen is a part of the State, and when he silently acquiesces in measures which his judgment tells him are fraught with evil to his country, he becomes

unworthy of the sovereignty conferred upon him by the Constitution.

Upon the advent of the Know-Nothing (since denominated by its friends the American) party, a large majority of the Whig leaders attached themselves to its fortunes, abandoned the old Whig party, and adopted an entirely new set of principles, not only differing from, but in my view eminently antagonistical to, those they had previously professed. In common with thousands of other old Clay Whigs, I have declined to participate in or be a party to the movement. Our absence has been to some extent supplied by a heterogeneous compound of all the isms and disappointed politicians of other parties. For reasons which I have stated at length in the articles referred to by the *Patriot*, I am satisfied that old line Whigs cannot consistently accord to it their support in the approaching Presidential election.

But the *Patriot* thinks that the refusal of old Clay Whigs to support Mr. FILLMORE, the candidate of the American party, can be regarded in no other light than as an act of political treachery to the old Whig party and principles! This, too, in the face of the oft reiterated declaration of its leaders that the old parties, being "*rotten and corrupt*," had been abandoned, and that "*upon their ruins a new and virtuous party had arisen, composed of the elite of all the old organizations*," and with entirely new issues and principles, which commended themselves to the support of the American people, no matter to what party they may have hitherto belonged. Would the *Patriot* have it understood now that the so-called American party is really and in fact nothing more nor less than the old Whig party under a new name, and thus impliedly admit, that these declarations have been made with the single purpose of *entrapping unwary or over-credulous Democrats into its ranks?*

But in another view: If, for the reason that I was an old Clay Whig, I cannot without treachery to my old principles, withhold my support from Mr. FILLMORE, would not the editors of the *Patriot* who were likewise old Clay Whigs, be guilty of equal treachery to those same principles, by conferring their support upon ANDREW J. DONELSON, who *never was a Whig*, who is not now a Whig, and who has, during his whole political life, been the constant and consistent opponent of Mr. CLAY and his principles? It cannot be a virtue in the editor of the *Patriot* to support Mr. DONELSON, (a life-time Democrat,) and a vice in other old Clay Whigs to support another Democrat. If the dissolution of the old Whig party

has left old Whigs no other alternative than to vote for an old Democrat in the approaching Presidential election, (and upon this point, if upon no other, I and the *Patriot* agree,) I think, in all fairness, they should be allowed *to select from among the best.*

Different and sometimes conflicting deductions may be extracted from admitted truths, but it is impossible to argue questions understandingly before an enlightened auditory, when the disputants differ in regard to the facts. When I stated in effect "that Mr. FILLMORE was nominated by a body of men of heterogeneous admixture, who were unsound on the questions most vital and important to the South, and inferred therefrom (amongst other reasons) that his nomination was a fraud upon the South, I thought I was stating an undeniable historical fact. But the *Patriot* takes issue with me, and says that "*the proposition cannot be sustained by the facts on a fair course of argument.*"

How else can we account for the bitter and calumnious assaults on the South by its Northern members? How else justify the conduct of Southern delegates who, with indignant scorn, denounced the Convention as a "*league of Abolitionists and traitors?*"

The *Patriot* surely has not forgotten the declaration of one of the delegates from Tennessee in a speech before the Convention, that—

"He had been in many Conventions of a political, religious and commercial character, and had witnessed rows in Congress and in State Legislatures, but that THIS WAS THE MOST DISORDERLY AND DISGRACEFUL CONVENTION HE HAD EVER SEEN!!"

The same speaker, in continuation of his remarks, said that he "had been in all sorts of fights with all sorts of people, but that he did not wish to lose whatever of *character* he might have, by mixing it up with such LOW-FLUNG MATERIAL AS HE FOUND THERE!"

When Mr. BENNETT, of New York, who was supposed by the Abolitionists to be what they term a "dough-face," arose to address the Convention, he was assailed by a torrent of hisses, yells, shouts and insults, to such an extent, it was seriously apprehended that violence to his person would follow; in the midst of which he exclaimed, "*I am not to be choked, or hissed down: I WILL SPEAK OR LEAVE THIS STAND A CORPSE!*"

When Mr. WOOD, of California, addressed the Convention "in defence (!) of the Southern Americans," (says a Tennessee delegate in his report of the proceedings,) "*as usual, he was interrupted and insulted at every point by THE VILE delegates*

from Massachusetts, Ohio, Michigan and 'Connecticut!!" And when the Hon. CHARLES READY, of Tennessee, (distinguished alike for his urbanity of manners and courtesy in debate,) addressed the Council in opposition to the repeal of the 12th section, we are informed by the same writer that "he was interrupted throughout his able and convincing speech by *insulting taunts and irrelevant calls to order by the dirty Abolition party!*"

The editor of the Knoxville *Whig*, in his notice of the speech delivered before the Convention by Gen. ZOLLIFFER, published in that paper, says :

"Gen. Z. in dealing out his facts and blows, enraged the Free Soil party to a pitch of desperation. They *hissed him—ordered him to take his seat, and otherwise insulted him, and all who were acting with him.* He became indignant, and *denounced them in withering terms; when the whole house became a scene of confusion, uproar and disorder, never before equalled in any assembly I was in. A rush was made towards the President's chair, where ZOLLIFFER stood, with the fingers, and hisses, and taunts of the vile, low flung, and disorderly Abolitionists pointed at him, as though they intended personal violence.* Southern men crowded around the stand, and cried out—"Say what you please, ZOLLIFFER; you can't be hurt." JOSEPH PICKETT, of Tennessee, sprang to his back, and told them to "*give them hell, and they should not even resent it.*" Another Tennessean told him to "*lay it on the negro-stealing villians, and that if THEY HAD THE NUMERICAL STRENGTH TO OUT-VOTE US, we had the ability and courage to KICK them out of the Hall!*"

The writer concludes the letter of which the foregoing is an extract, by saying :—

"I have not overstated this picture, but have, on the main and leading points, correctly posted up my readers. * * I have no confidence in any oaths, obligations or pledges taken by these vile Abolitionists."

Mr. KYLE, of Ohio, "contended that the principle of the 12th section, *could not be acknowledged by any American, North;* he said that he dared not, would not, and could not act, nor would Ohio act, with the American party, so long as that platform was retained."

Gov. FORD, of the same State, said, while the 12th section was under consideration, "that liberty was national, and slavery sectional," and he declared that he would sooner be found "*stealing negroes from the South, and running them off to the free States, than to be found aiding in hunting them up, and returning them to bondage!*"

The facts here mentioned are derived altogether from the

published statements of Southern delegates. I might swell these extracts to columns, and indeed others of a still more discreditable character, from well authenticated sources; but why pursue further the humiliating details? Do not these furnish sufficient evidence in support of my assumption, that the Convention which nominated Mr. FILLMORE, was a "*heterogeneous admixture of discordant elements?*"

A few words now in reference to the attitude of the majority of that Convention "*on the question most vital and important to the South.*" It will be remembered that two delegations from Pennsylvania claimed seats in the Convention—the one representing the regular National 12th section party, the other the seceding Abolition party. *The latter was, upon a test vote, admitted to take their seats, by a vote of eighty-four to forty-five, against the united vote of the Southern delegates.* The editor of the Knoxville *Whig* says, in reference to this subject, writing from Philadelphia:

"Even the vile and unprincipled rascals, who seceded in June last, are here, and have been allowed their seats, at least a portion of them. They have no right to seats in this body, *but the ruffians have the power, and they have voted themselves in!* The convention adjourned to meet again to-morrow, when the Abolition forces will pitch into the 12th section, *and no doubt repeal it!*"

And when the question of the repeal of this section came before the convention, we are informed by the same writer that "there was a fierce war and a protracted debate," and that

"Various amendments and substitutes were offered, *and several test votes were taken, resulting generally in ninety-five favoring the Abolition views and seventy-five favoring the National party, composed of Southerners—the New York delegation acting with the South.*"

The 12th section was repealed, and, as if the South was not already sufficiently humiliated by the character of their proceedings, the convention, by vote, declared its "opposition to the reckless and unwise policy of the present administration, as shown in *re-opening sectional agitation, by the repeal of the Missouri Compromise!*" When it is considered that every delegate from the South, who was a member of Congress at the time, *voted for that repeal*, that every Southern delegate then present *cordially approved the measure*, and that the entire party in the South, had, in common with the Democracy, planted itself upon the platform of the Kansas-Nebraska act of disenfranchisement, it may readily be inferred that the thrust was not intended so much to wound the administration, as to inflict a bitter rebuke upon their Southern associates.

Having thus selected at random, a few dainty bits from the feast to which the *Patriot* has invited me, I submit to the candid reader, no matter what may be his "political affinities," whether I have not fully established the truth of my declaration, that the "materials of which that convention was composed, were discordant, and that the majority was unsound upon the question most vital and important to the South." I have only to add, to complete its history, that this convention, thus constituted, nominated Messrs. FILLMORE and DONELSON, for the Presidency and Vice Presidency.

If Mr. FILLMORE is national in his political faith, then he does not fairly represent the principles of the majority of the convention which nominated him, and which had the numerical strength to reject him, and we have a right to conclude that it was no part of their purpose to aid in his election to the Presidency. It is, therefore, clearly manifest that, in allowing the Southern members to bring forward Mr. FILLMORE as their candidate, the Northern majority merely meant to present an insuperable obstacle to the union of the South, while they, by uniting their fortunes to that of the Black Republicans, would, in the struggle for the Presidency, present an undivided front. It must be concluded by even the most sanguine of Mr. FILLMORE's friends that there is not the remotest probability of his election, unless he can obtain the cordial support of the Black Republican party. This he cannot do, if he be a true man; or, assuming such a combination possible, it is an association which does not commend itself to the patriotic regard of national Whigs.

I desire to say, in conclusion, that I do not wish to be understood as casting censure upon the Representatives of the South in that convention. On the contrary, I felt gratified, as a Southern man, on witnessing the bold, determined and dignified stand they assumed and maintained in every emergency; and I can only regret that they had not abandoned it altogether when they discovered that the majority were determined to deny to the section they represented, the equal rights to which they are entitled under the Constitution. But the *Patriot*, in the blindness of infatuated zeal for its party, declares that the Philadelphia Convention "was as pure a body of national patriots as ever assembled in this country!" A convention, which, if we are to credit the concurrent testimony of all who witnessed its proceedings, was signalized by more violence, more blackguardism, more evidence of sectional bitterness, and less regard for the decencies of that Christian faith of which they profanely assumed to be the guardians and exponents, than ever before characterized the doings of any po-

litical body, claiming to be national. This convention may be remembered hereafter, but surely never as an evidence of the purity or patriotism of the party it assumed to represent, until these words shall have lost their significance.

There are points in the history of nations, of political parties, and of individuals, which are preserved as beacon lights for posterity. The reproachful exclamation of the unfortunate Madame Roland, when dragged to execution, under the bloody code of the French Republic, (O Liberty! what crimes are not committed in thy name!) still rings in our ears, a warning against the substitution of unbridled license for rational liberty. The proceedings of the Hartford Convention will be a profitable lesson to both patriots and incipient traitors, long after the individual actors who participated therein, are forgotten; and the genius of Protestantism, in after times, may well point to the wild orgies of this politico-religious convention which assumed for itself the especial guardianship of the true Protestant faith, as a warning against the evil consequences of allowing political parties to make the Christian religion a cloak, under cover of which to attain power by trampling upon that liberty of conscience, and freedom of religious opinion, which has been guaranteed by our fathers to every citizen of the Republic!

CHAPTER V.

The Abolition faction—Interference of Great Britain—her sympathy with the Abolitionists—Advent of Know-Nothingism—The Leaders abandon the Whig party—Its discordant materials—Speaker Bank—Union of Black Republican and Know-Nothing parties, North—Democratic leaders who have left the party—Its consequent purification.—A. J. Donelson.—Will Old Whigs abandon their principles?

The last few years has produced many changes in the attitude of political parties. During a long period of time preceding the last Presidential nominations, the country, as has been stated, was divided into two great national parties, who contended with varying success for the control of the government. There existed during this period a small but growing faction in the North, composed chiefly of fanatics, who advocated the elevation of the negro race to a social and political quality with the whites. These zealots were in the

habit of presenting a practical illustration of their theory, by admitting the negro to terms of close intimacy, and it was no unfrequent spectacle in northern cities, to see delicate ladies walking the streets, hanging upon the arm of a sooty African. By degrees the ranks of this faction were swelled by the acquisition of all those who, from envy, malice, or sectional prejudices against the Southern States, conceived that they could most effectually gratify these feelings of animosity, by attacking the institution of slavery. Inflammatory publications emanating from the North, were circulated throughout the slave States, with a view to create discontent among the slaves, and to render that species of property dangerous to the citizens, and insecure to the owners.

Our old enemies in Great Britain, ever on the lookout to take advantage of our weak points, witnessed with gratification the germination and growth of that feeling in the North, which would inevitably, if persevered in, weaken the bonds of brotherhood between the two sections, and possibly end in the disruption of the great Republic, by dissolving the confederacy between the free and the slave States. She sent over her orators to traverse the free States for the purpose of descanting upon the horrors of slavery in general, and especially of black slavery in the Southern States of America. These incendiary emissaries were received with open arms by the Abolitionists, and a systematic warfare was agreed upon by the enemies of the South on both sides of the Atlantic. Forgetful of the sufferings of thousands of starving subjects of the British crown—oblivious to the fact that the entire career of British conquests has been marked by the tears and blood of those whom she has subjugated—heedless of the atrocious cruelties which have signalized for centuries her treatment of the conquered provinces of India, where millions of human beings have been swept from the earth, and where the remainder of that once enlightened, but unhappy people, have been degraded to the condition of brute beasts, by the rapacity of British rule—they mingled their crocodile tears over the hard fate of their enslaved colored brethren in the Southern States.

The abolitionist who made himself notorious, by bitter denunciation and foul slanders of the South, was enthusiastically welcomed into the saloons of the Dukes and Duchesses, Lords and Ladies of aristocratic England. That grasping nation desired to weaken the growing power of the Republic, whose proportions were becoming so formidable as to excite her alarm for the future, and if she could accomplish our humiliation through the instrumentality of our own recreant sons,

her nobility might well afford to abate a little of their ancestral pride in the presence of her American allies.

As this faction grew in strength under the fostering care of this British and American Alliance, disappointed politicians began to look to it as a means of advancement, and by the skilful management of these new leaders it assumed larger proportions, but was still too weak to make head against the National parties, until the meteor-like advent of Know-Nothingism, and the consequent dismemberment and downfall of the Whig party as a National organization.

At another time I purpose to allude more in detail to the origin and principles of the new party. It is sufficient for my purpose, to state the historical fact, that the great body of the Whig politicians, as if by preconcerted arrangement, abandoned the old Whig ship that had borne them gallantly through many a storm—proclaimed her weather-beaten hull to be rotten and unseaworthy, and ensconced themselves behind the ramparts of Know-Nothingism. Each particular State or section declared a set of principles for the new party, adapted to that special locality. In the South, of course, the party planted itself firmly upon the platform of Southern rights. In the North, the restraints imposed by the old Whig principles, being removed, they adopted the creed of the Abolitionists, and at once united with that old faction in a bitter sectional war against the South. Many Democrats also swelled the ranks of the new party, and for a while a series of brilliant triumphs signalized their career.

But the time arrived when it became necessary for the different sections to meet together in a National Council, and then became apparent the hopelessly discordant materials of which it was composed. Then was made manifest the folly of those Whig leaders in the South, who abandoned the old Whig party, to unite their fortunes with another, which had no common basis upon which the different sections could stand. But it was too late to recede. The leaders had irrevocably united themselves with the fortunes of the new party—they had pronounced the Whig party to be “dead and buried,” and they could not and would not attempt to accomplish its resurrection.

Another Congress assembled, and for the first time in the history of our government, Great Britain had the satisfaction of perceiving that her allies, the Abolitionists, were in the ascendant. A union of the Northern Know-Nothings and Free-Soilers produced this result.

Mr. BANKS, of Massachusetts, the leader of the Black Republican party in the House of Representatives, in reply to a question propounded, as to which was the superior race, the

white or the black, declared his inability to decide the question, but broadly intimated that the solution would be found in *the amalgamation of the two, and the consequent absorption of the inferior race.*

This man, after the enunciation of this sentiment so revolting to every principle of honor, propriety, or decency, was chosen Speaker, amid the booming of cannons, the ringing of bells, and the jubilant shouts of the enemies of the South.

They have now sunk all minor differences of opinion and have entered the lists for the Presidency, upon the sectional issue, "That all the Territories of the United States, shall be reserved for the exclusive benefit and use of ^{the} States of the Northern States, while the citizens of the Southern States must confine themselves within their present territorial limits!"

I have already in my previous communication indicated the result of the second effort of the Know-Nothings, South, to nationalize their party at Philadelphia, and have established beyond any doubt, that the Abolition majority in that Convention permitted the nomination of Messrs. FILLMORE and DONELSON to prevent the union of the South upon any one national candidate, and with the intention of uniting themselves with the Black Republican party. Having thus presented frankly and fairly, the attitude of these two parties in reference to the next Presidential election, I propose briefly to allude to those changes, which circumstances have produced, in the Democratic party.

The sudden rise of the Know-Nothings, and the rapid expansion of the Abolition party upon the dissolution of the old Whig party, necessarily involved changes in the Democratic party. Disaffected and disappointed politicians, together with all its Northern supporters who entertained a feeling of sectional hostility to the slave States, seized upon the occasion to unite themselves to one or the other of these parties. This ordeal, although it weakened the Democratic party for a time, purified, by purging it of many of those who had been in times past most obnoxious to the conservative portion of its old adversaries. VAN BUREN, against whom the Whig party for so long a time contended, deserted the Democrats and arrayed himself in the ranks of their enemy! THOS. H. BENTON, long the prominent leader in opposition to Mr. CLAY and the Whigs, followed the lead of the "sage of Kinderhook." FRANCIS P. BLAIR, the editor of the *Washington Globe* during the period of its most vindictive assaults upon all the best men and measures of the Whig party, is now in close communion with SEWARD, GARRISON, and GREELEY, and is co-operating with them in de-

vising the most effective means of concentrating all the enemies of the South in opposition to the Democratic party. And ANDREW J. DONELSON, less known to fame than either of those named, though the editor of the *Washington Union* in opposition to the administration of Mr. FILLMORE, has not only left the Democratic ranks, but is now the candidate for the Vice Presidency, upon the ticket with Mr. FILLMORE! The Democratic party, thus purified, and with its great national principles emblazoned upon its banner, presents itself for the approaching struggle.

- I have thus briefly, and without undue prejudice or partiality, defined the present attitude of parties. I have stated facts only, leaving candid minds to draw the inferences.

I have only to add in this connection, the conviction upon my own mind, that old Clay Whigs cannot, without to some extent abandoning their old principles, refuse to accord their support to the Democratic party, if a true man is nominated for the office of President; and that, in opposing the VAN BURENS, the BENTONS, the BLAIRS, and the DONELSONS, they will stand precisely where they stood of old, *when battling against these same men under the lead of the noble and gallant CLAY!*

CHAPTER VI.

Teachings of Henry Clay.—Fate of his old party.—The duty of those who cherish his principles.—His opinions on Abolitionism.—How the Whig party was destroyed.—Letter from a son of Henry Clay.—Mr. Clay's opinions of Foreign-born citizens.—The Catholic Religion, and Liberty of Conscience.—Know-Nothing oath.—Mr. Clay against Know-Nothing principles.—Whigs should support the National party.—Note to the Editors of the *Nashville Gazette*.

I know only one safe rule in all the vicissitudes of human life, public and private, and that is conscientiously to satisfy ourselves of what is right, and firmly and undeviatingly to pursue it, under all circumstances, confiding in the great Ruler of the Universe, for ultimate success.—HENRY CLAY.

These noble words were uttered by HENRY CLAY in the darkest and gloomiest period of his political life. They are words which should sink deep into the hearts of all who honored him while living, and who still cherish the recollection of his greatness and of his patriotism. The old Whig party,

as a political organization, has perished by the hands of its own children—it has fallen a victim to Abolitionism, and a lust for the spoils of power. The old followers of Mr. CLAY, who still remain faithful to his principles—the remnant of that once formidable party, of which he was for so many years the recognized head—must either remain inglorious spectators of the great struggle which is approaching, and upon the result of which may depend the perpetuity of our great confederacy, or, in obedience to the injunction of their departed leader, “satisfy themselves of what is right” and throw the weight of their influence wherever they conscientiously believe it will be most conducive to the welfare and happiness of the people, and to the perpetuity of our institutions. Weak as they admittedly are, in a party sense, they are powerful in their native honesty and indomitable patriotism.

What is now the particular line of duty for old Whigs to adopt, in reference to the parties which are arrayed for the present struggle? The questions to be decided are well known, and the principles of these parties are clearly defined. Let us take counsel from the teachings of our old leader, and see if he has not left upon the record some lessons which may be useful to us in the determination of this question. Mr. CLAY, in his great speech in the United States Senate, on the subject of Abolitionism, said :

“Sir, I am not in the habit of speaking lightly of the possibility of dissolving this happy Union. The Senate knew that I have deprecated allusions, on ordinary occasions, to that dreadful event. The country will testify that, if there be any thing in the history of my public career worthy of recollection, it is the truth and sincerity of my ardent devotion to its lasting preservation. But we should be false in our allegiance to it, if we did not discriminate between the imaginary and real dangers by which it may be assailed. *Abolitionism should no longer be regarded as an imaginary danger.* The Abolitionists, let me suppose, succeed in their present aim, of uniting the inhabitants of the free States, as one man, against the inhabitants of the slave States. Union on one side will beget union on the other; and this process of reciprocal consolidation, will be attended with all the violent prejudices, embittered passions, and implacable animosities which ever degraded, or deformed human nature. * * * One section will stand in menacing and hostile array against the other. The collision of opinion will be quickly followed by the clash of arms. I will not attempt to describe scenes which now happily lie concealed from our view. Abolitionists themselves would shrink back in dismay and horror at the contemplation of desolated fields,

conflagrated cities, murdered inhabitants, and the overthrow of the fairest fabric of human government that ever rose to animate the hopes of civilized man."

When these words fell from the lips of the great orator, Abolitionism had not twenty representatives on the floor of Congress. And yet, he declares that "*Abolitionism should be no longer regarded as an imaginary evil.*" What would be his language now, if he could rise from his grave and, entering that Hall where are assembled the Representatives of the people of this great Confederacy, he should behold the chair which he had occupied as presiding officer, now filled by an avowed Abolitionist—chosen to that high position by Abolition votes? In the ranks of that foul party he would find the great body of those, who, under his teachings, had been members of the great Whig family. But he has not left us in doubt as to the manner in which, as patriots, we should act in such a contingency. As if his far-seeing mind beheld in the distant future the occurrence of such a calamity, he said:

"Whenever the Whig party shall become merged into a miserable sectional Abolition party, I WILL RENOUNCE IT FOREVER, and in the future act with that party, REGARDLESS OF ITS NAME, which stands by the Constitution and the Union."

Who can doubt where CLAY would now stand, if he were living? Has not that period arrived which his prophetic vision seemed to behold in the future—when his old party has been merged into Abolitionism?

The first blow that was struck at the integrity of the Whig party was directed by Abolitionism. It insidiously wound itself like a serpent around its victim, and all of the old vitality that was left in its system was crushed out by the new party, which boasts that it "*arose upon its ruins.*" What honest and true Whig heart will not beat responsive to every thought—every sentiment—every word of the following letter written by a son of HENRY CLAY, to a Democratic Club in New York?

ASHLAND, Jan. 3, 1856.

GENTLEMEN: * * * I find myself standing amid the ruins of a great party which was endeared to me by a thousand ties of education, of association and memory. That party has no longer an organized existence—*destroyed, I verily believe, by treason to its principles in its own ranks.* Thousands in the land deplore with me its destruction, and are now, as I am, anxiously looking for the right path to follow, and the true party to which to attach themselves. * * * I am not presumptuous enough to desire to intrude upon your notice the

political ideas of an individual so humble as myself, but of this, gentlemen, you may be assured, that any party which in good faith puts forth its banner inscribed the Union and the Constitution at all risks, and all hazards—which proclaims itself to be in favor of maintaining with equal justice, the institutions of every State and section, allowing the citizens of each to regulate their domestic concerns, according to their own views of their own happiness and interest, and *which is opposed to all bigotry and fanaticism, religious or civil*, will have my cordial sympathy—*no matter under what name it may be arrayed.*

With great respect, your obedient servant,

JAMES B. CLAY.

This letter breathes a true and noble spirit. It evinces that patriotic regard for the welfare of the country which is a characteristic of the remnant of that stern old party to which he so feelingly refers. But we are admonished by HENRY CLAY, that in a condition of the country like the present, *all patriots should unite to together in one great party, irrespective of all former differences*, in opposition to Abolitionism. He was a party man, but with him all questions of a personal or party nature were made to succumb to the higher incentives of patriotism. He was a party leader; but whenever the institutions of his country should become imperiled, he would, if necessary, yield the proud position of commander of his own host, enter as a private in the ranks of that party which presented the most formidable barrier to the aggressions of Abolitionism, and *there do battle for the security and perpetuity of the Republic.* But his lessons of wisdom stop not here. His teachings leave no doubt upon the minds of those who have studied his principles as to which party he would have attached himself in a conjuncture like the present. You may search the records of his whole life, public and private, from the period we first read of him as the "mill boy of the slashes," to the last moment of his eventful career, and you will not find a single sentiment, or thought, or word, or syllable in unison with a distinctive principle of the Know-Nothing party. Mr. CLAY was open, bold, and manly in the enunciation of his sentiments. He addressed the *reason* and the *understanding*, but never the *passions* or the *fanaticism* of the people. He would direct the energies of his mighty mind to soothe and allay the bitterness of contending sects and sections, but never did he prostitute the powers of his intellect towards arousing *sectarian* or *sectional* bitterness. He has not only left this negative testimony against the principles which lie at the foundation of Know-Nothingism, but his recorded opinions furnish positive and spe-

cific evidence of that opposition. Mr. CLAY was born, and lived and died a Protestant. It was the faith of his fathers, and he breathed his last breath of life under the ministrations of a Protestant clergyman. But still he believed that others might differ with him in religious opinions and be patriots. Who can read the following letter and believe that HENRY CLAY, if he were living, would sanction the religious intolerance of Know-Nothingism?

WASHINGTON, March 23, 1850.

DEAR SIR:—I have received and attentively perused the letter which at the instance of the President and faculty of the University of the Notre Dame du Lac, you addressed to me the 4th inst. In that letter they have done me the honor to express their approbation of a speech of mine in the Senate of the United States, the objects of which was to heal all differences, and amicably to adjust all controversies arising out of the existence of slavery in the United States. Such testimony, proceeding from a highly respectable body of gentlemen, retired from the world, and regarding justly the interests which belong to another and future state of existence as paramount to all others, affords me no inexpressible degree of satisfaction.

Nor is this at all diminished by the fact that we happen to profess different religious creeds; for *I have never believed that that of "the Catholics was anti-American and hostile to civil and religious liberty."* On the contrary, I have with great pleasure, and with sincere conviction, on several public occasions, borne testimony to my perfect persuasion that *Catholics were as much devoted to civil liberty, and as much animated by patriotism as those who belong to the Protestant creed.*

I am not surprised that in the seclusion of those whom you represent, great solicitude should be felt for the safety and preservation of that Union, which is our surest guarantee of peace, order, liberty and public happiness. I hope and believe the dangers which appeared to threaten it have diminished; but there is still great occasion for the exercise of a spirit of concord mutual concession and harmony.

I request you to present to the President and Faculty, assurances of my respectful acknowledgment, and accept yourself those of your respectful and obedient servant,

H. CLAY.

Nor is this all the testimony he has left upon the record of his life. His mighty intellectual efforts in the cause of South American emancipation, were alone sufficient to surround his name with a halo of glory. In one of his greatest speeches,

delivered in the Senate of the United States, upon this subject, he says :

"With regard to their superstition—they worship the same God with us. Their prayers are offered up in their temples, to the same Redeemer whose intercession we expect to save us. NOR IS THERE ANYTHING IN THE CATHOLIC RELIGION UNFAVORABLE TO FREEDOM. ALL religions united with Government are more or less inimical to liberty—all SEPARATED from Government are compatible with liberty."

The last sentence of the above extract, deserves and should receive the calm attention of every true Christian, who cherishes in his heart a love of liberty. Mr. CLAY spoke from the teachings of history. He had read of the bitter fruits of religious animosities in the past ; he had seen that persecution begets persecution, and that the purity of religion is destroyed when party politicians attempt to prostitute it to their own selfish purpose. He knew that religious fanaticism, when wielding the powers of government, was never satisfied with anything short of the blood of its victim, and he had witnessed in our own happy land the fruits of religious toleration, where every man by the constitution of the country could worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience. Upon every occasion during Mr. CLAY's entire political life, when it became necessary to express his opinions upon the influence exercised upon public liberty, by religious sects, he maintained undeviatingly the same opinions. He believed, with Mr. Jefferson, that no form of Christian worship was incompatible with liberty, so long as its discussion was confined to the pulpit. Separated from politics and parties and government, he believed, that all religions were compatible with the highest degree of freedom. That he had no fear that the Pope of Rome would invade the liberties of the Republic, is farther established in his speech in the United States Senate in 1825, when he said :

"I think the honorable gentleman from Virginia does great injustice to the Catholic religion in specifying that as one of the leading causes of the decline of Spain. It is a religion entitled to great respect ; and there is nothing in its character incompatible with the highest degree of national prosperity. Is not France, the most polished, in many other respects the most distinguished, State of Christendom, Catholic ? Is not Flanders, the most populous part of Europe, also Catholic ? Are the Catholic parts of Switzerland and of Germany less prosperous than those which are Protestant ?"

Let us turn now to that only remaining distinctive principle of Know-Nothingism, which demands the political proscription of foreign born citizens. In his speech in the Senate of the

United States, on the American system, Mr. CLAY gave utterance to the following language :

"The honest, patient, industrious GERMAN, readily unites with our people, establishes himself on some of our fat lands, fills his capacious barns, and enjoys in tranquillity the abundant fruits which his diligence gathers around him, always ready to fly to the standard of his adopted country, or of its laws, when called by duties of patriotism.

"The gay, the versatile, the philosophical FRENCHMAN, accommodating himself cheerfully to all the vicissitudes of life, incorporates himself without difficulty in our society.

"But of all the foreigners, none amalgamate themselves so quickly with our people as the NATIVES OF THE EMERALD ISLE. In some of the visions which have passed through my imagination, I have supposed that Ireland was originally part and parcel of this continent, and that by some extraordinary convulsion of nature, it was torn from America, and, drifting across the ocean, was placed in the unfortunate vicinity of Great Britain.

"The same open-heartedness, the same generous hospitality, the same careless and uncalculating indifference about human life, characterise the inhabitants of both countries. Kentucky has sometimes been called the Ireland of America. And I have no doubt that if the current of emigration were reversed, and set from America upon the shores of Europe, every American emigrant to Ireland would there find, as every Irish emigrant here finds, a hearty welcome, and a happy home."

I appeal to those who were once the sincere followers of Mr. CLAY, upon conviction of the soundness of his principles—no matter what may be their present party associations—to ponder well these lessons which he has left as a rich legacy to his countrymen. See how well his principles and opinions accord with the genius of our free institutions! Consider them attentively, and then imagine (if you can conceive a spectacle so humiliating) that you see him entering a Know-Nothing Lodge to engraft himself into that order! Imagine that you behold him standing with form erect and majestic mien, to take the required oaths necessary to constitute him a member of the new American party! Imagine that you hear read to him the words of the oath which he is invited to take :

"You (HENRY CLAY) promise and declare that you will, when elected to any office, *remove all foreigners, aliens or Roman Catholics from office; that you will not appoint any such to office; and this you promise and declare on your honor as an American, to sustain and abide by, without any hesitation or mental reservation whatever—SO HELP YOU GOD and keep you steadfast!*

* * * You furthermore promise and declare *you will not vote nor give your influence* for any man for any office in the gift of the people unless he be an American-born citizen, in favor of American-born citizens ruling America, nor if he be a Roman Catholic; that you will not, under any circumstances, *expose the name of any member* of this order, nor *reveal the existence of such an organization*; and that you will *ever seek the political advancement* of those men who are good and true *members of this order!*"

HENRY CLAY take such an oath as this! He who declared that foreign-born citizens "*were always ready to fly to the standard of their adopted country, or of its laws, when called by duty or patriotism,*" SWEAR that he would proscribe those men from all public employment, no matter what might have been their services or their merits! He who had expressed his "*sincere conviction on many occasions that Catholics were as much devoted to civil liberty, and as much animated by patriotism as those who profess the Protestant creed,*" call God to witness, that he would exert all his influence to prevent these same Catholics from holding any office under the Government, even though their ancestors may have shed their blood, and with their lives sealed their devotion to liberty in the revolution which secured our independence!

Never! never would HENRY CLAY have subscribed to such an oath! It would have amounted to a recantation of every great principle of his life. It would have annihilated the foundation upon which the superstructure of his fame had been erected. It would have broken the charm which lingers about his name as the great apostle of human liberty. The famed advocate of South American regeneration would have dwindled down into the dimensions of a sectarian politician. In short, HENRY CLAY would have been no longer the HENRY CLAY of history—no longer the HENRY CLAY who still lives in the hearts of his countrymen, and in the admiration and respect of the world.

My object in grouping together these records of the opinions and sentiments of this great man, is, that we may take counsel from his teachings. He has told us what he would regard as his duty if the Whig party of the North should become Abolitionized—he *would leave it*. We are not called upon to leave the Whig party; for, by the treachery of those we trusted, it no longer exists. He has told us that in a conjuncture like the present he would throw the weight of his influence with that party most capable of resisting the monster of Abolitionism—and he has indicated his devotion to the principles of civil and religious liberty. We trust that his lessons of wisdom and

patriotism may not be lost upon those who claim to be his followers and disciples.

But it is fair to presume that Mr. CLAY was not opposed to "Americans ruling America." There breathes not a citizen of the Republic, from the wilds of Oregon to the snow-clad mountains of Maine, who is not in favor of "Americans ruling America." No American, be he native or foreign-born, has ever expressed a wish that any other than "Americans should rule America." None but Americans ever have ruled America since our forefathers wrested their liberties from a foreign tyrant, and it is the fervent prayer of every true patriot, that none but American citizens ever shall rule the proud Republic of America. *The PEOPLE of America are the rulers of America*, and are the *only* rulers recognised by the Constitution and Laws of our country !

After a calm survey of the present attitude of parties, I am more and more confirmed in the opinion that old line Whigs should confer their support upon the candidates of the Democratic party in the approaching contest, under the conviction that it interposes the only barrier to the triumph of Abolitionism. But by this course it should not be considered that Whigs are committed to act in future with that party, unless upon a settled conviction of its propriety. In co-operating with the Democratic party now, Whigs are actuated by a high sense of duty, in view of an important crisis—they can resume their ancient organization, or unite with any other, without inconsistency, and without incurring the reproaches of those with whom they only profess to act *for a special purpose and on a single occasion*.

In adopting this course, the satisfaction we derive from the faithful performance of a patriotic duty is enhanced by the fact, that we are violating no principle that we have ever professed, but that we are acting in obedience to the teachings of that great and good man who may be said to have been the father of the Whig party.

NOTE — My attention has been directed to an article in the *Gazette*, concerning my unpretending "Suggestions and Reflections," conceived and executed in that flowery and poetical style, peculiar to Know Nothing literature. The points of the argument, so far as I have been able to extract them from the immense superfluity of verbiage, in which they are shrouded, are 1st. That Mr. CLAY, during his life, was a badly abused man; 2d. That if living, he would not, in the present "state of parties," co-operate with the Democratic party, and that he would be found in the ranks, of the Know-Nothings; and 3d. That all old Clay Whigs who differ with the *Gazette* upon these points, were either hypocrites in the past, or are so now. It is clear that the editors of the *Gazette*, however well versed they may be in the pious teachings of our holy religion, the sufferings of the saints, and the ter-

rible trials of Maria Monk, have never studied deeply the character, nor read attentively the history of this great man. If so they would not, while professing to shield his reputation from the calumnies of the past, have uttered a greater than them all, by intimating that if now living, Mr. CLAY would deny those great principles of civil and religious liberty, which through life he so eloquently defended—the advocacy of which has added such a lustre to his renown, and which may be regarded as the base of the pyramid upon which the superstructure of his greatness has been reared. Will the *Gazette* do all concerned the justice to publish the “teachings of Mr. CLAY,” which precedes this note?

CHAPTER VII.

Know-Nothing Leaders boast that they Destroyed the Whig Party.—They repudiate its principles.—The Whig Party was pure and patriotic—owes no allegiance to Know-Nothingism.—Know-Nothings had a right to desert the Whig Party, believing its principles wrong.—Whigs owe no allegiance to any party, but their Country.—The great struggle is on the question of Abolitionism.

“The American party having risen UPON THE RUINS, and IN SPITE OF THE OPPOSITION OF THE WHIG and Democratic parties, *cannot be held in any manner responsible, for the OBNOXIOUS ACTS, or VIOLATED PLEDGES of either.*”
—*Know-Nothing Platform of 1855.*

The above is the deliberate declaration of the American party, as enunciated by their National Convention, which met in Philadelphia in 1855. So far as that announcement relates to the Democratic party, it is simply ridiculous, except in so far as it may have served the purposes of such members of that party as desired some pretext for abandoning their old, and establishing new, political associations. But as regards the Whig party, the ungenerous boast is but too well founded. The American party did establish itself upon the ruins of what was, in its essential elements, one of the most patriotic parties that ever perished by the hands of those in whom it trusted. Had this new party contented itself with the simple declaration, that the Whig party had been so far prostrated by its reverses, as to render futile all attempts of its friends and adherents to reinstate its fallen fortunes, and that, therefore, they had formed new combinations upon more popular issues, while the announcement might have been received with regret,

It would not have been regarded by old Whigs as cause for serious complaint.

But, not satisfied with simply abandoning the Whig organization, for one whose principles were more attractive, or which promised a more speedy reward for partisan services, they add insult to unkindness by intimating that they have been impelled thereto on account of the "*obnoxious acts and violated pledges*" of that very old Whig party, whose fortunes and destiny they themselves had in a great measure shaped. What, let me ask, were those "*obnoxious acts*" and "*violated pledges*" which thus enkindle the patriotic bosoms of these politico-religious reformers? It is not only unjust to make vague and uncertain charges against those with whom we may differ in opinion, but it is illiberal, unmanly, and ungenerous, when the party assailed is rendered by misfortune incapable of defence. That the Whig party may have committed many errors during its long and eventful career, may, without disparagement, be readily admitted—for to err is human—but that its purposes were patriotic, and its measures of policy conservative and national, and in strict accord with the great and fundamental principles of civil and religious liberty, is established by the record upon every page of its history. Its legitimate aims have been sometimes perverted to suit the selfish purposes of political adventurers; but the foundation upon which it was built was sound, and the great leaders, who may be said for so many years to have ruled its destiny, and to have been identified with its fortunes, have left behind them names which will ever be identified with the glory of the Republic.

The American party was not content, however, with the announcement that it had risen upon the ruins of the Whig party. They add thereto the boast that it had established itself *in spite of the opposition of that party*. Nay, more. They assail the Whig party in the grave to which their own act has consigned it—and ask that they may not be held responsible for its *obnoxious acts and violated pledges*! And who are those who evince such alacrity in relieving themselves from the odium of these obnoxious acts and violated pledges? Why they are chiefly the recipients of the honors, and the trusted leaders of that very party which they so wantonly assail.

Many old Whigs, deceived by the appearance of their old leaders in the ranks of the Know-Nothing party, have imagined that "*American*" was but a new name for the old party to which they had been all their lives attached; while in truth (as they virtually declare in their platform) it rests its claims to the confidence of the nation, upon its abandonment and repudi-

ation of old Whig principles. Conscientious Whigs who still cherish a regard for the principles of their old party, and their old leader, should consider well before leaping the abyss which divides them from those who proudly boast that they have *arisen upon the ruins—in spite of the opposition—and free from responsibility for the obnoxious acts and violated pledges of the old Clay party!*

Thus insultingly repelled by the American party, and without a political organization, each Whig is left to determine for himself the proper course for him to pursue in the present emergency. Nor should we be deterred from the performance of this duty by the unmeaning epithets and invectives of those who have deserted our ranks, and have established themselves as leaders of another party. What right have they to claim our co-operation with, or our sympathy in, the fortunes of a party whose success would be our condemnation? What right have they to denominate us as traitors, because, in the exercise of the prerogatives of freemen, we elect to attach ourselves to another party, which has stronger claims upon our confidence? What right have they to charge us with hypocrisy in the past, because, in view of a great impending evil, we conclude to combine our influence with that party, which is alone capable of successfully averting it?

Traitors to what, and to whom? To the Know-Nothing party?

That party proclaims that it has arisen in spite of the opposition of the old Whig party, and surely it will not be claimed that we owe allegiance to a party to which we never belonged.

Are we traitors to the Whig party?

You say truly, that it is dead, and that you have planted yourselves upon its ruins. How can we be traitors to that which does not exist?

Are we traitors to those old Whig leaders, who are now the leaders of the American party?

Except as the exponents of our principles, we owed them no allegiance, and they have not only abandoned those principles in the organization of their new party, but they claim exemption from all responsibility for the obnoxious acts and violated pledges of the old Whig party.

Do the Know-Nothings charge us with being traitors to our old Whig principles?

As well might Arnold, when he deserted the flag of his country on account of what he declared to be the "obnoxious acts and violated pledges" of our revolutionary fathers, have charged treason upon the faithful soldiers who would not follow him into the camp of the enemy. Every true-hearted old

Whig is proud of his old party, and does not blush to defend its principles ; while *they* beg for quarters, on account of their past misdeeds, and ask to be relieved from the responsibility of their former "obnoxious acts and violated pledges." But a truce to such unprofitable discussions! They have preferred to abandon their party, and to attach themselves to another ; from whatever motive, whether patriotic or otherwise, it is not our province to determine. They had a right to do so. We have an equal right to refuse to follow. Nay, more—if we believe their doctrines to be obnoxious to the principles of free government, and freedom of religious opinion, we would be wanting in the essential duties of good citizens, if we abstained from the expression of that conviction.

No! We owe allegiance *to our country only* ; and we will be traitors indeed, if we suffer ourselves to be deterred from the faithful performance of our duty as citizens, by idle charges of inconsistency, or unmeaning epithets uttered by those who only exhibit their bad taste and bad cause, by resorting to such puerile weapons. The wreck and ruin of our old party left us alone in the midst of the political elements, which were war-
ring around us. Some of us may have inclined to one side, and others to another ; but we have thereby incurred no obligation to any. Many of us have occupied a position of neutrality, awaiting the development of events, which should determine us as to our future course. It is too late now to accomplish any good, in the present crisis, by a re-organization of the Whig party with a view to separate action. The period has arrived when we must take a position for the conflict with one or the other parties now organized, or be inactive spectators of one of the most stupendous struggles that has ever agitated the Republic.

It is a struggle in which a great Northern party has arrayed itself upon a sectional issue, involving in its consequences all that the South holds dear. It is a struggle upon their part to filch from the Southern States those constitutional rights, which she cannot surrender without dishonor, disgrace, and ruin ! It is a struggle on their part to accomplish that which, if successful, will make this confederacy of States as prolific of evil in the future, as it has been fruitful of blessings in the past. On our side it will be a struggle to maintain and defend those equal rights, which are dearer to us than the Union itself. If we, in the Southern States are united, the victory is easy and sure, for there is a strong conservative element in the North, upon which we may rely with unwavering confidence ; but if, on the other hand, we suffer ourselves to be divided, no political seer can foretell the result and its consequences.

One fact is startlingly apparent. If there occurs such a diversion in the South in opposition to the National Democratic candidate, as will prevent a choice in the Electoral College, the duty of *electing a President of the United States* will devolve upon the same House of Representatives which elected the *Black Republican, Banks, Speaker!!*

CHAPTER VIII.

Response to the Patriot—The question at issue—Abolitionism of the Philadelphia Convention—Testimony of Southern Delegates—Gov. Call and others retire from the Convention—Present platform a fraud—Summing up—Know-Nothing party—Sectarian but not National—The Patriot as a teacher—Its inconsistency—Abolitionism the great question of the day.

I have read with much care and attention the rejoinder of the *Patriot* to the reply of an Old Clay Whig; and I have no hesitation in admitting the ability with which it has grouped together the strong points in its argument, and the ingenuity evinced in making those points available to its main purpose. The article in question furnishes additional testimony to the truth of my declaration, that in the *Patriot*, old line Whigs "had a skilful, able, and accomplished adversary." I beg the editors of that paper to consider, however, that the admission on my part of the "distinguished ability with which the *Patriot* had been conducted," was not designed as a personal compliment to them. The writer of these articles is certainly under no obligations, from any motives of courtesy due to the editors, to "wreath his instrument in the flowers of compliments." But, in assuming my self-imposed task, my purpose was to deal in *facts*—stubborn, undeniable, incontrovertible *truths*! In my estimate of the *Patriot*, I merely echoed the general sentiment of its friends as well as its adversaries, that it occupied a high ground as the exponent of Southern Americanism. On assuming new relations to a new party, and abandoning the principles of the Whig party, it had frankly repudiated even the name of "Whig." In short, that it was an adversary to be dreaded, was an undoubted, existing "fact," with which Anti-Know-Nothing-Whigs had to grapple. It was a *fact*, the existence of which I was not inclined to withhold, even although

its enunciation might convey an incidental compliment where no such courtesy was either deserved or intended. Even the "beggar in his rags," or the "cripple upon his crutch," has too much self-respect to bestow personal compliments upon the flippant coxcomb who flaunts in his face his poverty or his misfortunes. My plain, unvarnished communications are not, it is true, built upon that ornate style of literary architecture which embellishes the columns of the *Patriot*, but upon the indestructible foundation of *truth—plain truth, and nothing but the truth!* While, therefore, I concede to the *Patriot*, fluency and ingenuity in the management of its case, I submit to the intelligent reader whether my facts have not been met by *errors and evasions—my arguments by declamation—and my reasonable deductions by flowers of rhetoric!* In addressing the public under the appellative of an "Old Clay Whig," I have divested myself of my individuality, and have spoken in the name of that grand old party, which, under the lead of the noble CLAY, attained to greatness only to perish at his death, under the repeated blows of old Abolitionism, and modern Know-Nothingism. Yes, our old Whig party is dead—yet it lives in the respect of its ancient foes, and in the affections of its old adherents, who will not affiliate with either of those elements which consigned it to an untimely grave. Having said this much by way of introduction and explanation, I will proceed to consider

THE QUESTIONS AT ISSUE.

I declare as facts—

1st. That the Philadelphia Know-Nothing Convention was compounded of discordant elements.

2d. That the majority was unsound upon the slavery question; and,

3d. I assumed that the nomination of MESSRS. FILLMORE and DONELSON was acquiesced in by that majority for the purpose of preventing the Southern members of the party from forming any other political connection, having for its object a combination of the Southern strength in the Presidential election.

The *Patriot* denies the facts and the inference, and declares that the Philadelphia Convention "*was as pure a body of national patriots as ever assembled in this country,*" and "*that the majority was sound upon the slavery question.*"

I must confess in the outset that I cannot withhold the expression of my astonishment, in view of the flood of testimony which has been furnished on the subject, that the *Patriot* can still maintain positions so untenable and so utterly irreconcilable, with all that has been written, published or spoken by

either friends or enemies. When I furnished testimony from the record of its own members, then and still high in the estimation and regard of the American party, showing the turbulent, vindictive and discordant nature of the proceedings of the Philadelphia Convention, the *Patriot* replies that it is not fair to rely upon "exaggerated reports written under excitement." That those reports were written "under excitement," I have no doubt; but were not all the Southern delegates excited under the same sense of wrong? If the public is not allowed to listen to reports made by members who were "excited," it will be equivalent to the utter extinction of all knowledge; for in a Convention where it was necessary to guard the speakers from personal violence by surrounding them with a wall of their colleagues, it is fair to presume that all were deeply excited. But what right has the *Patriot* to assume that the reports were "exaggerated?" Have any others appeared giving a conflicting version? It is important to bear in mind that the subject which produced all this excitement was the direct, naked question of abolitionism, without any admixture, or any other disturbing element. Let us now briefly examine the records to discover which side of this issue had the greatest number of adherents.

THE TESTIMONY.

In the article to which the *Patriot* replies it will be remembered that I founded my argument upon the published report of Southern delegates only. I selected my testimony (with the view to avoid any charge of unfairness) entirely from an American Fillmore and Donelson journal, published in Tennessee, high in the confidence and esteem of its party, and whose editor was a participator in, and an eye witness of, all that he describes; and yet, so far from commending my fairness in this regard, the *Patriot* says:

"The Old Clay Whig is wrong to rely on the statements of ribald scribblers. It is as unjust to himself as to the American party."

If I had entertained a doubt as to the correctness of those reports, I should not have referred to or relied on them. Truth and truth alone, was what I sought; and I submit to the candid reader whether the reports published in the *Knoxville Whig* do not correspond with all the contemporaneous accounts which were made public by the press. It will be remembered that the editor of the *Whig* in writing out a history of the proceedings in reference to the repeal of the slavery section of the platform, says:

"VARIOUS AMENDMENTS AND SUBSTITUTES WERE OFFERED AND

SEVERAL TEST VOTES TAKEN, RESULTING GENERALLY IN NIKETY-FIVE FAVORING THE ABOLITION VIEWS, AND SEVENTY-FIVE FAVORING THE NATIONAL PARTY."

Here is a fact from the record—the actual vote upon each side is given, showing, according to the statement of a FILLMORE and DONELSON journal, the editor of which was present, a large "ABOLITION" majority upon several test votes. I will, however, notwithstanding the positive and reliable testimony thus furnished, seek corroboration from other sources; and I think that I can establish my positions from documents published in the columns of the Patriot, with its commendation and endorsement. First, I invite the reader's attention to the following extract from the letter of Governor CALL, of Florida, published in the Patriot of the 10th of April, and heralded by that paper as an "important, forcible and lucid exposition, which every voter should read." The extract refers to the substitute offered for the old platform, and which by its adoption, repealed the famous 12th section. It must be borne in mind that the "substitute" referred to is now the Platform of the party. Gov. CALL says:

"The action of the council on the subject was hasty and inconsiderate. THE SUBSTITUTE WAS ADOPTED UNDER THE APPLICATION OF THE PREVIOUS QUESTION, WITHOUT DEBATE OR AMENDMENT. Still I voted for it, under the hope, that something would be done to RENDER IT ACCEPTABLE, FIRMLY RESOLVED, IF DISAPPOINTED IN THIS HOPE. I WOULD DISSOLVE MY CONNECTION with the National Council, and the National Convention. So soon as the new platform was adopted, the National Council adjourned *sine die*."

Here we find that the *last act of the National Council*, which repealed the slavery section of their June platform, was *so adverse to the South* that Gov. CALL declares his determination to dissolve his connection with both the Council and Convention, unless something is done to render it more acceptable! Would the *Patriot* have us to believe that a *minority* could force a vote upon a proposition under the operation of the previous question, and that a *minority* could absolutely adopt and carry that proposition?—that a *minority* could so trample upon the rights of the South as to force the Southern representatives to retire? But let us examine a little farther into the proceeding of this "pure and patriotic" (!) body of "National Patriots," (!) to discover some other evidences of their attachment to the South. I will again make a witness of Gov. CALL, who says:

"On the next day the National Convention met, and its organization brought into active conflict ALL THE DISCORDANT

ELEMENTS of which it was composed. From the State of Pennsylvania there were two delegations—one adhering to and standing on the principles of the 12th article of the platform of 1855, the other *overleaping it, and DISREGARDING all its provisions*. The debate was long and animated, and resulted in sustaining and admitting to their seats in the Convention the delegation coming in **OVER**, and *disregarding the principles of the 12th article of the Platform of 1855!*"

We have here not only positive evidence of the overpowering influence of the abolition element, but proof that they were determined to override every principle of justice, by excluding the delegation which stood upon their own platform, and receiving others who had repudiated the party. The *Knoxville Whig*, in its account of this act of the Convention, very pointedly says:

"Even the vile and unprincipled rascals who seceded in June last are here, and have been allowed their seats. * * They have *no right* to seats in this body, but **THE RUFFIANS** have the power, and have voted themselves in!"

It will be seen from the foregoing, that the testimony furnished by my "excited witnesses" and "ribald writers" corresponds, in every essential particular, with that furnished by Gov. CALL, who makes his statement after weeks of deliberation. He refers to the same "*discordant elements*," and the same disregard of the principles of the 12th section—the same anti-Southern feeling and also furnishes the most indubitable testimony to the fact that the abolition element upon all these *test votes, was triumphant!* The humiliation of the South was complete—there seemed no hope left. They had been defeated upon every issue, and had been grossly insulted whenever they arose to defend their rights. In this unhappy state of affairs, what was done by the chivalrous representatives of the down-trodden South? Let Gov. CALL tell the story himself. In the letter before referred to he says:

"On the morning of the 23d of February, *I retired from the Convention*, after a full and frank declaration of the causes and motives by which I was actuated. When I retired from the Convention the distinguished representative from Alabama, Mr. WALKER, retired also, and all the delegates from the South."^{*}

* The *Patriot* in reply to the foregoing expose of the abolition tendencies of the Philadelphia Convention, instead of frankly admitting a fact so notorious that but few even among the most devoted friends of the American party pretend to deny or bring in question, endeavored to make a personal issue with An Old Clay Whig, by the preposterous charge that some extracts from the letter of Gov. CALL were garbled to suit the purpose of the

What further testimony can be required to establish the correctness of my positions, and the utter fallacy of those which have been assumed by the *Patriot*? The abolition majority would listen to no compromise; they would accept of no concessions which did not involve the humiliation of the South. Southern members struggled manfully, but in vain, against the overwhelming torrent. Seeing that it was hopeless to expect any justice at the hands of a ruthless majority, *they retired in a body*, amid the hisses and jeers of the triumphant adherents of Abolitionism.

But the *Patriot* declares, in the face of this cloud of testimony, that the majority of that Convention was "patriotic and national," and by no means "unsound on the question most vital to the South!" We have read in history of large armies being beaten and put to flight by much smaller bodies of better disciplined and more courageous troops, but if the *Patriot* is correct, the Philadelphia Convention furnishes the first illustration in a deliberative assembly of a MAJORITY *retiring discomfited, beaten, and despairing*, and leaving a triumphant and exultant MINORITY *in full possession*. Leaving the *Patriot* to extricate itself, if it can, from the absurdity of its position, I invite attention to the following extract of a letter published in the Nashville *Banner*, from THOS. H. CLAY, giving his version of the manner in which the South was cheated :

writer." Whether Gov. CALL meant what he says is not important as touching this question, but that I gave to it the legitimate construction which the words and the order in which they are placed would not only justify but require, I think no one who reads will doubt. It will be seen that my argument was predicated upon the account of the proceedings of the Convention furnished by Gov. CALL, because it had been endorsed and commended by the *Patriot*. The fact was notorious that a large number of the leading Southerners had retired from the Convention, and Gov. CALL among the number. In commenting upon this fact, I adopted his statement as to the particulars. The entire sentence from which I made the extract is in the following words :

"On the morning of the 23d of February, I retired from the Convention, after a full and frank declaration of the causes and motives by which I was actuated. When I retired from the Convention, the distinguished representative from Alabama, Mr. Walker, retired also and all the delegates from the South, and indeed all conservative men from the North would have retired, but for the hope they entertained that the disposition of the Convention would assume a more favorable aspect."

I desire to call the special attention of the reader to an important fact which plainly appears in the foregoing extract. If I had inserted the *whole sentence*, instead of extracting only a portion of it, it would have *strengthened my position* an hundred fold. It would have been and is, conclusive, upon the principal point at issue in this discussion. What is that question? I have insisted that the majority of the Philadelphia Convention was unsound upon the question most vital to the South. The *Patriot* denies the correctness of my

"The design of striking out the 12th section of the old platform was soon made apparent. **WE, OF THE SLAVE STATES, HAD NOT THE NUMERICAL FORCE IN THE COUNCIL TO PREVENT THIS.** But we said to those delegates, What guarantee will you give us, in lieu of that Section or Resolution? You say, with **THAT SECTION IN THE PLATFORM, YOU CANNOT CARRY A SINGLE FREE STATE.** Without it or some similar guarantee, do you suppose that we of the South, could carry a solitary one of the Slave States?"

It must be borne in mind that the Southern delegates withdrew from the Convention, chiefly because the slavery section of their platform had been repealed by the adoption of a substitute, and a platform which they regarded as inimical to Southern rights. Now that same section, unrepealed, still appears upon the record—that *same substitute, without a solitary amendment, now stands as the official platform of their party!* But let us see what sort of a platform this is, and what was thought of it by its

position, and brings forward Gov. CALL as witness to justify this denial. If the reader will consider the above extract entire, which the *Patriot* charges me with having garbled, he cannot fail to perceive that *the portion which I did not publish* decides the question against the *Patriot* in a way that can leave no doubt upon the mind of the most prejudiced defender of that Convention. Assume to be true the *Patriot's* version, and what do we learn from it?

First, that the Convention repealed the Slavery section of their old platform by the adoption of a new one, which Gov. CALL regarded as so very obnoxious to the South that he took the extreme method of declaring his disagreement by formally withdrawing from the Convention. He further informs us that not only the entire Southern delegation but *all the conservative men of the North, would also have retired with them*, but for the hope they entertained that by remaining they might bring about a change in the feeling of the Convention. Now if the proceedings were "ground upon the question most vital to the South," why, in the name of all that is reasonable, would Gov. CALL and the entire Southern delegation be inclined to withdraw? Or, if the majority was "patriotic" and "national," what possible motive could influence all the conservative members from the North to retire from the Convention with the representatives of the South? Is anything more clear than that Gov. CALL means to be understood that the proceedings of the majority had been so offensive to the South and to the conservatives of the North that they would all have dissolved their connection with the Convention, but for the hope that other and better influences might produce a change? The sequel proved, however, that even this hope was fallacious, for the Convention refused to the last to remodel the objectionable platform, or to reconsider the repeal of their old Slavery section: and this platform, objectionable as it was, *now stands word for word, and letter for letter, as it stood when Governor CALL retired from the Convention!*

The reader will readily perceive that my position would have been materially strengthened if I had adopted the interpretation of the *Patriot* and had published the sentence entire, though at the moment I had not perceived that there was any ambiguity in the phraseology.

friend [redacted] on this substitute was under consideration in the Convention.

"Mr. SHEETS of Indiana, said he was willing to accept a compromise, but the *Twelfth Section must be got rid of*; he was willing to accept the Washington Platform; for if there was anything in it, *it was so covered up in verbiage, that a President would be elected before the people would find out what it was all about.*

"Mr. SHANKLAND, of Ky., said he could not, by his vote, sanction any such attempt to dupe the people. He considered the new Platform as vague, unsatisfactory, and unmeaning—as a mere trick that politicians might ride into office at the sacrifice of principle. He could not, therefore, consent to assist in the fraud.

"Mr. UNDERWOOD, of Ky., member of Congress from the Third District, said that with a view to the conciliation of the different conflicting interests, he has been willing and anxious to compromise any differences where the rights of the South were not to be sacrificed. But the new platform he had carefully studied, and regarding it, he had come to the same conclusion announced by his colleague, (Mr. SHANKLAND.) He, therefore, voted against it."

SUMMING UP.

Here then we have a brief outline of the prominent points in the history of the Convention, furnished in the main, from carefully considered articles published in the *Patriot*. We see a triumphant Abolition majority overriding the national and conservative element, until, stung beyond the point of endurance, *the minority from the South retire in a body from the Convention!* It was manifest that there was an impassible gulf between the two sections. They could never be made to harmonize, for the simple reason that the Northern section would not, and the Southern section could not, compromise on the slavery question. As a national party, they ceased to exist from the moment the Southern delegates withdrew from the Convention. The determination of the Northern majority, to affiliate, as a body, with the Black Republicans, was then made manifest. But it was also clear that if nothing further was done, the Southern section of the party would, in self defence, be forced to resist the combination, by a like combination with the Democratic party in the South.

I appeal now to the candid, unprejudiced and common sense reader, if it is not fair to conclude that the sole purpose of inviting Southern delegates back, to nominate FILLMORE and [redacted] was not, by giving them the candidates of their

choice, to effect an irreconcilable division in the South. The Northern section of Know-Nothingism never in a vote for FILLMORE and DONELSON. Their entire proceedings furnish proof conclusive, that they were not only in a majority, but bitterly hostile to the South. If Mr. DONELSON, instead of boasting that he owned one hundred negroes, had declared that his slaves numbered seven hundred, they would have been better satisfied, as it would have furnished for them six hundred additional reasons why they would not support him. Let us now briefly examine the attitude of

THE PATRIOT AS A TEACHER.

The *Patriot* thinks that before deciding not to support the candidates nominated by this Convention, I should have taken council from the Editors of that paper. I did do so. I read with avidity the eloquent articles which appeared in the *Patriot* scarcely two short months ago, and they inspired me with new ardor in the cause of the South. The resolute determination of the *Patriot* to stand by the Slavery question at all hazards and to the last extremity, met my most unqualified approbation. The solid and dignified *Banner*, and the enthusiastic and versatile *Gazette*, in vain put forth their efforts to change the current of public opinion. The eloquent and truthful appeals of the *Patriot* overrode all opposition, and on the assembling of the State Convention it was triumphantly sustained by that body. On the 12th of February last, the *Patriot* in a most forcible article in opposition to the repeal of the 12th section, tells us that—

"It has been long years since it (Abolitionism) was an abstraction. Commencing as a sentiment in the sickly brains of a handful of ideal perfectionists of the North, WHAT WAS THEN A TINY CURRENT, HAS SWOLLEN INTO A MIGHTY TORRENT, THREATENING TO UNDERMINE THE FOUNDATIONS OF THE REPUBLIC, AND BEAR IT AWAY UPON ITS BOSOM, A RUIN AND A WRECK. It is too late in the day to think of ignoring a question which has grown so strong, that it will force itself to be KNOWN AND FELT.
* * * * * IT HAS BECOME A GREAT, LIVE, EARNEST, PRACTICAL QUESTION. IT IS WRESTLING WITH THE GOVERNMENT FOR ITS VERY LIFE!!"

These were the patriotic outpourings of the heart, in view of an impending calamity. The little brook meandering in a sequestered valley of the North, had grown into a mighty torrent, which threatened to sweep away every interposing barrier. The Government itself was wrestling for its very life with the monster Abolitionism. The *Patriot* beheld the danger,

the Convention in Tennessee recognized its existence and all resolved, that, as a party, they would stand or fall, sink or swim, survive or perish, with the Slavery section of their platform. But all would not do. The great Council of the nation assembled at Philadelphia, and amid the glad shouts of triumphant Abolitionism, the repeal of the 12th section was accomplished! But they did not stop at this. Abolition triumphed in everything—it insulted every national man who attempted to interpose, and finally drove every Southerner from their Council! Where now do we find the *Patriot*?—*Defending the action of this Convention*, and proclaiming it to be as pure a body of National patriots as ever assembled!! But this is not all. The swelling buds, the heralds of approaching spring, were just appearing, when the *Patriot* told us that Abolitionism was the great, live, practical question that was wrestling with the Government for ITS VERY LIFE, and now, almost before those buds have bursted into bloom, the *Patriot* gravely informs its readers that “*Black Republicanism in itself is insignificant and harmless.*” And that it is an “artful trick to attempt to produce the impression that Black Republicanism is to be a principal combatant in the great tourney of this year.” The present attitude of the *Patriot* is painfully inconsistent with that which it occupied in February; and it is most clear that it was either endeavoring to create a false alarm of danger then, or it is seeking now to lull the public mind into a fatal security.

There is a point in the article to which this is a reply, that requires a passing notice. In making a charge of “flagrant treachery” against old Whigs who differ with the editors of that paper, the *Patriot* says:

“Nor can this conduct be extenuated by quoting from intemperate Americans, that the Whig party was rotten, or corrupt, or dead, or IN RUINS. They know these charges to be false.”

And in another article it says: “We have never said that the Whig party was dead.” Not dead and in ruins? Why it has been the theme of almost every Know-Nothing orator and newspaper writer of that party for months, that both the old parties have perished of their own inherent corruption, and out of this mass of impurity, Americanism had emerged as pure and as uncontaminated as a vestal. The Whig party not in ruins? Why look back to the columns of the *Patriot* of the 21st of February, and read what the editors themselves have said:

“We are gratified to learn that the Southern members of the National American Convention had resolved to stand by the 12th section of the platform of last year at all hazards.”

And now turn to that famous section of the June platform,

which has been the theme of such eloquent commendation, and you will find that it declares—

“XII. The American party having ARISEN ~~THE~~ RUINS, and in spite of the opposition OF THE WHIG and Democratic parties, cannot be held in any manner responsible for the obnoxious acts or violated pledges of either !”

Is the *Patriot* then to be regarded as one of the “intemperate Americans” whose statements are not to be relied on? But, admitting that this constitutes a sufficient plea in extenuation for newspaper editors and stump orators, surely the Grand National Council which deliberately incorporated this declaration in their platform, will not be excused by the *Patriot*, on the score of “intemperance,” or undue excitement.

CONCLUSION.

I have thus grouped together a few prominent facts, bearing upon the questions in controversy. Whether these facts are sufficient to sustain my positions, the reader can decide.

That the so-called American party in the North is completely and entirely abolitionised, no candid man will deny. Mr. T. H. CLAY tells us in his letter, that *they could not carry a single Northern State* if they retained the 12th section; and when it is remembered that that section demands nothing more for the South than the maintenance of her present acquired rights, Southern men can readily understand the strength of that abolition feeling, which is conveyed in the announcement of this fact. For one, I cannot believe that the monster of Abolitionism, with which the “government two months ago, was struggling for its very existence,” has all at once become so insignificant, as it is now represented to be by the leaders of the American party! I distrust the sudden conversion of our editors, to the opinion that Black Republicanism, has in a twinkling, grown so feeble and innoxious. I still believe, as did the *Patriot*, and, no doubt, the “American” State Convention, which assembled in Nashville in February, that Abolitionism is the “GREAT, LIVE, EARNEST, PRACTICAL QUESTION,” which overrides all other questions, and which “CANNOT BE IGNORED.”

CHAPTER IX.

Religious disputes fomented by Tyrants and Demagogues, for selfish purposes—Instances in the history of the past—The bloody consequences of religious wranglings—The French Revolution—Result of the persecution of Catholics—Religion destroyed, and the existence of a God denied—Abrogation of the Sabbath—The Churches all closed—Religious freedom established by our forefathers—Persecution never makes converts—Catholic Priests never interfered in our Government, while Abolition Protestants have.

Having considered the present position of parties in reference to what may be properly regarded as the great question of the day, and having shown that in view of its overshadowing importance to the rights and liberties of the South, all other subjects of difference should be held in abeyance, in order to accomplish a perfect union of the whole South against the dangerous encroachments of Abolitionism, I propose now very briefly to refer to some of the most objectionable features in the American or Know-Nothing declaration of principles. I propose to exhibit also the antagonisms of those principles to the great fundamental doctrines of the old Clay party.

Religious controversies have in all ages been the fruitful implement of aggrandisement for demagogues and tyrants. When you attack the religion of a truly sincere man, you assail that which he holds more dear than life itself; and it is on account of the strength of this religious sentiment, and the honest conviction of the purity and truth of one's own particular religious principles, that it is so easy for artful and designing men to convert this pious faith into a fanatical zeal for the extermination of all other forms of faith than those which we ourselves have adopted. On almost every page of the history of the past, we learn that blood, and misery, and crime, have followed in the footsteps of religious persecution, without being attended by one single blessing to mankind. Tyrants have no doubt been often actuated by motives of zeal for the propagation of their faith in their persecution of opposing sects, but it has been more frequently the case that fanaticism has been merely the instrument by which they sought to accomplish their own selfish purposes. The bloody massacre of St. Bartholomew, in which sixty thousand Huguenots were murdered in cold blood, was planned and ordered by the infamous Catharine de Medicis, who was not herself either a Catholic or a Protestant, from any sentiment of religion. At one period of her life she inclined to Protestantism, but political considerations induced her to favor the cause of Catholicism. The Huguenots were her enemies in the State; and to consolidate

her power, she conceived it necessary to annihilate them. The fanaticism of the Catholics was her only instrument for achieving this diabolical assassination. Henry VIII. of England, the most formidable of all the enemies of Romish supremacy, was actuated by no higher motive than to change the seat of Christian temporal power from Rome to London, and to make the head of the church the King of England instead of the Pope of Rome. In effect, so far as Britain was concerned, he succeeded. He caused the Catholics to be beheaded, and was sustained and encouraged thereto by the Protestants; while the Protestants who were opposed themselves to the tyranny of his iron will, perished at the stake, amid the rejoicings of the Catholics. He used the fanaticism of each against the other, and made their faith and their mutual hatred the instrument for the accomplishment of his own selfish and bloody purposes. Queen Mary, in turn, became the instrument of the Catholics in her persecutions of those who had adopted the faith of her father; while Elizabeth, the great head of Protestantism, signalized her reign by the persecutions of her Catholic subjects. Where terrible punishments are inflicted upon men for ordinary crimes, their fellow-men look on and weep under the influence of pity for their misfortunes; but history teaches us that the most horrible tortures inflicted upon those whose only crime consists in their religious creed, are regarded by opposing sects with gratification and joy. Elizabeth could command the execution of a Catholic priest in front of the prison of Queen Mary, with the unworthy purpose of torturing the feelings of the unhappy captive by the spectacle, but fanaticism did not recognise the bloody act as a wrong.

The most fruitful lessons which the pages of history furnish upon this subject are to be found in a detail of the causes which made the French revolution the most hideous crime that ever stained the annals of any nation. Had the French people contented themselves with the overthrow of the political despotism under which they had groaned for so many ages, the revolution would not have been degraded by those horrible atrocities which made the very name of liberty odious. If they had been satisfied with the establishment of religious and civil freedom, without attempting to destroy the church, liberty would have been established and perpetuated. But the ruthless vengeance which at first sought to crush only an objectionable form of Christian worship, ended in the overthrow of all religious faith. The war upon Catholicism was carried on, not by Christians and reformers of other creeds, but to these were added all the *INFIDELS and Atheists of France*, who gladly availed themselves of this popular fury against that particular form of

worship to strike a fatal blow at Christianity itself. And well did the end justify their expectations. Tens of thousands of Catholic priests paid the penalty of their devotion with their blood, and to be a Catholic was a crime sufficient to send the purest citizen to the scaffold. Young girls were sent by dozens to the guillotine for the crime of worshipping the Almighty according to the faith their fathers had taught them. At length, says LAMARTINE, "*it drew every worship into the proscription of Catholicism.*" And the representatives of the French nation decreed that there was no God but Reason. The churches were all closed, the Sabbath was abrogated, and a saturnalia of blood, and debauchery, and crime, such as the world never before witnessed, was the result. LAMARTINE, in his history of the Girondists, says:

"The profanation and devastation of the temples, the dispersion of the faithful, and the imprisonment and martyrdom of the priests, was more and more encouraged. *The Directors of the Departments forbid the institutions to pronounce the name of God in their tuition to the children of the people.* ANDRE DUMONT, in mission at the Departments of the North, wrote to the Convention: "I arrest the priests who permit the Sabbath. I cause the cross and the crucifix to disappear. I am in ecstasy—intoxicated. In every direction the *churches are shut*, and wadding for cannon is made of the sacred books of the Liturgy. All the citizens cry out, 'No more Priests—Equality and Reason!'"

The people were avenged by their power to insult what they had so long adored, confounding the Deity himself in their resentments against his worship. The Commune desired to replace the ceremonies of religion by other spectacles, but sincerity of purpose was utterly wanting at these *fetes*. There was no adoration at these meetings—no soul at these ceremonies. *Religions do not spring up in the market-place at the voice of legislators and demagogues!*

The inauguration of this worship took place at the CONVENTION. CHAUMETTE, accompanied by the members of the Commune, and escorted by a vast crowd, entered the apartment to the sounds of music and the chorus of patriotic hymns. He conducted by the hand one of the handsomest courtesans of Paris, the idol being half covered with a long blue veil. A band of prostitutes, her companions, followed, escorted by a group of seditious citizens. The foul assemblage entered the hall confusedly, and seated themselves on the benches of the deputies. CHAUMETTE advanced and raised the veil which covered the courtesan, and her beauty striking the multitude, he ex-

claimed—"Mortals, recognize no other Divinity than Reason, of which I present to you the loveliest and purest personification." At these words he bowed and made a semblance of adoration. The President of the Convention and the people affected to pay a similar worship."

These were the legitimate and natural consequences of the persecution of a particular form of Christian worship by the government. And to the consequent annihilation of all religion may be ascribed the fatal excesses which degraded the revolution. Their statesmen at length discovered that when the people do not believe in the existence of a God, and where death is regarded as an eternal sleep, there can be no government. ROBESPIERRE, therefore, proposed to the Convention the following decree:

"Art. 1st. The French people recognize the existence of the Supreme Being, and the immortality of the soul."

"Art. 2d. They acknowledge that the worship worthy the Supreme Being is the practice of the duties of man."

But to return to a consideration of this question in our own land. Our forefathers, in the formation of this great Republic, and in establishing it upon the eternal foundations of justice and truth, profited by the teachings of history, and by the experience of their own ancestors. The Puritans, by persecution, had been driven to the inhospitable shores of New England—the Quakers to Pennsylvania, and the Catholics to Maryland. Unitedly they entered upon the great struggle for our independence, and by their joint labors and blood, our liberties were achieved. In framing the Constitution—that great chart of freedom—they incorporated a provision, that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States," and further, that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." The American party, therefore, in their proscription of a certain religious denomination, in addition to other great evils which result therefrom, most clearly and palpably violate a cardinal principle of the Constitution. In a Republic the people is the sovereign; and when the people deny to a man, or class of men, the rights guaranteed to them by the Constitution, it is in effect the denial of the sovereign to permit the enjoyment of such rights. It is the establishment and exercise of a power greater than the Constitution.

But, aside from this objection, what good can result from the persecution or the political ostracism, of a particular denomination of Christians? I appeal to good men and to Christ-

ians ! Do you purpose thereby to reform what you suppose to be their errors ? You will, only add to their zeal and enthusiasm for their own religious belief. The more you persecute them, the more firmly will they resist all your efforts. Suppose that the members of a political party should bind themselves by paths to use their utmost efforts to deprive the members of your branch of the Christian church from all "offices or public trust under the United States,"—and suppose such a party should succeed in getting control of the Government—would you not consider that you were debarred from the exercise of your constitutional rights ? And do you not think that, instead of weakening, it would strengthen your attachment to your religious creed ? But above all, when religious discussions are taken from the pulpit and transferred to the grocery, the market-house, and the political arena, it brings religion itself into disrepute. It is a subject too high and too holy to, be entrusted to the keeping of grog-shop bullies, and bar-room politicians, and cannot fail to suffer by the contact. It is the fruitful parent of Infidelity and Atheism ; and probably it was a knowledge of this fact, which induced the American Convention to begin, where the French Convention ended, by declaring their belief in the existence of a Supreme Being.

But, why should we wage this bitter war against Catholics ? Have they not manifested as much alacrity to march to the battle-field when their country claimed their services, as any other citizens ? Did they not spill their blood, in common with the blood of the Protestants, in the great struggle for our liberties—in our wars with Great Britain and with Mexico ? And did they not encounter the hardships of Indian warfare, all to win for themselves and their posterity a happy home in this land of freedom ? And shall we deny to them the privileges which they have won by their heroism, and their devotion to liberty, because they choose to worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences ?

Do you fear the Pope of Rome ? He is only protected in his own small dominions by the army of a friendly power. Do you fear the influence of the Catholic clergy in our own government ? *Not one holds any office*, either in the gift of the people, or the Executive ; while Congress is filled with fanatical anti slavery ministers of other denominations ! Do they attempt to coerce, or in any manner to interfere with the government in the discharge of its duties ? Of the *three thousand Ministers of the Christian Religion*, who impudently, presumptuously and profanely declared themselves authorized, in the name of Almighty God, to demand of Congress to refrain from the performance of an act of simple but long delayed justice

to the South, NOT ONE was a minister of the Catholic religion! Patriots should pause and consider well before they take a step so opposed to the interests of Christianity, to the rights of good and honest citizens, to the genius of our institutions, and to the spirit of the age in which we live.

CHAPTER X.

Command of the Almighty—The Bible against Know-Nothingism—Condition of the Children of Israel, compared to that of our forefathers—America the asylum for the oppressed—Law of Naturalization—Foreigners have aided us in our wars—Know-Nothings against Lafayette—against the Constitution—When they disfranchise Catholics, they will make war on Protestant acts—Separation of Church and State—Should the Constitution be mutilated?

“And if a stranger sojourn with thee in your land, ye shall not vex him. But the stranger that dwelleth with you, he shall be unto you as one born among you, and thou shalt love him as thyself: for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt.”—*Holy Bible.*

How admirable is the spirit and sentiment of the foregoing command of the Almighty to the Children of Israel! It was addressed to a people who had themselves been but recently driven from their homes by the oppressions of the Egyptians, amongst whom they had dwelt. It was a commandment to those who had tasted the bitterness of persecution, and who had been led by Omnipotence into a “land flowing with milk and honey.” The occasion, too, upon which this mandate was enforced, and the time of its promulgation, makes still more impressive the lesson of charity which it inculcates. The Children of Israel had endured all manner of cruelties at the hands of those among whom they had lived as strangers; yet when they had secured a home of their own in the land given to them by the Almighty, they are told by that high power which had delivered them, “if a stranger sojourn with thee in your land, ye shall not vex him.” Although dwellers in the land of Egypt, they had been subjected to the most cruel bondage by the Egyptians; yet when they are delivered, they are told that “the stranger that dwelleth with you shall be unto you as one born among you, and thou shalt love him as thyself.” It was not necessary to enforce this command by any argument as to its

propriety; for those to whom it was addressed had themselves been "strangers in the land of Egypt."

There is a striking similarity in the condition of the Children of Israel at the period alluded to, and that of the founders of our Republic, when they were called upon to establish laws for the government of the new world. They, too, and their fathers, had been driven by wrongs and by oppressions, to seek for themselves a new home, where they would be beyond the reach of their persecutors. They profited by the teachings of experience, and instead of retaliating upon others the injuries which had been heaped upon them, they decreed that liberty to all, which they in vain had sought in the land from whence they had come. They proclaimed to the whole world in accordance with the divine precept, that the stranger who dwelt among them should be as one born in their midst, no matter what might have been the land of his nativity.

The proudest boast of the true American, has ever been that this Republic offered an asylum for the oppressed of every clime and every religion. Our portals have been thrown wide open—our invitation has been wafted upon every breeze to every land where dwell the victims of tyranny, to come and partake in the blessings of freedom; to come all who are "weary and heavy laden," and find rest, in the bosom of this land of liberty! To the down trodden million; to the persecuted reformer; to the fugitive monarch; to all of every degree, from the cottage to the throne, who seek security from persecution, the invitation has been extended, to come and partake of that great boon of liberty and equal laws, which has been bequeathed to us by our revolutionary fathers. The Constitution of the Republic is the crown of her sovereign, the people—it is a crown more precious, far, than the crowns of jewels and gold which encircle the brows of despots. Surely we will not ruthlessly pluck away its brightest gems, to gratify the ambition of demagogues, the unfounded prejudices of the ignorant, or the intemperate zeal of fanaticism!

If the Know-Nothing party had contented itself by a simple attempt to change or modify the existing laws upon the subject of naturalization, it would not have involved any other question than one of mere expediency, on which Whigs may or may not have agreed with them, without any abandonment of principle. If the time required for foreigners to remain in the country before they can become citizens is too short, amend the law in that particular, and extend the term of probation to twenty years, or even more, if the interests of the country demand it. But it should not be attempted to deprive foreign-born citizens of the political privileges they have already ac-

quired, by a compliance with existing laws. They are just as much entitled to the enjoyment of all the rights of citizens, thus guaranteed to them, as we who are citizens by the accident of birth upon the soil. The sovereign people, through their laws, have invited strangers to come amongst them, offering them as an inducement, to guarantee the enjoyment of equal privileges, after the lapse of a specified time. How unjust then, in these same people to swear, notwithstanding this compact, that those who avail themselves of this offer shall never, by their consent, enjoy these rights.

Why should a party in the United States manifest so much bitterness of feeling against all who have been born in a foreign land? We are ourselves almost strangers, and even now there are those living who fought side by side with a foreign army sent from a foreign land, to aid us in our first battles in the cause of liberty. The most trusted friends of Washington, in that great struggle, were natives of a foreign land; and foreign-born citizens have ever since, in all our wars, manifested a love and a devotion to our country well worthy the imitation and commendation of all true patriots. But were LAFAYETTE himself alive and a citizen of the Republic which he materially aided in establishing, he would find many of those very men whose liberties he had purchased as it were with his blood, sworn to withhold from him the most insignificant office within their gift.

The principles of every party in a republican government should be consistent with the fundamental doctrines of the Constitution. They may differ on questions of policy or expediency, and still be true and loyal to the government; but that party which advocates the establishment of "a religious test as a qualification to any office or public trust under the the United States," or which proposes to disfranchise foreign-born citizens, who are already by our Constitution and laws, entitled to certain privileges, are just as guilty of opposition to the spirit of our institutions as though they advocated the establishment of a monarchy.

Many persons have identified themselves with the Know-Nothing party, on account of their hostility to the Roman Catholic church and to foreigners, without reflecting that by becoming members of the order, they array themselves in opposition to the spirit of the Constitution, and to the faithful execution of existing laws. These say that they but exercise the rights of freemen in voting for, or withholding their support from, whomsoever they please.

I beg such as honestly attempt to acquit themselves of the wrong by this mode of reasoning, to consider well the actual

position in which they stand. First, they are sworn to oppose the elevation of any Catholic or foreign-born citizen, to any office, whatever, under the government. When men take this oath, they of course mean thereby to declare their conviction that these proscribed classes should not enjoy the privileges thus denied. If they are correct in this, the Constitution, which prohibits all religious tests, is wrong. And if they are sincere in the expression of their convictions upon this point, then it is equally manifest that they ought to desire such an amendment to the Constitution as will make that instrument conform to this theory. I submit to every candid investigator of causes and effects, whether this is not an inevitable conclusion from the premises. If this principle of the Know-Nothing creed does not involve a change in the organic law, which will render it effective, it means nothing. It is absurd to declare a law to be wrong, and at the same time that it is not right to amend it. So it is equally absurd for a party to declare that members of a certain Christian church should, on account of their religious opinions, be denied the political privileges of other citizens, and yet take no steps to accomplish by law that disability.

Let us imagine that party to have attained to the accomplishment of their purpose, in getting the control of this government. Let it be supposed that they will succeed in attracting to their support a majority of the people of the Republic, and with the sovereign power in their own hands, that they set to work to carry out the principles which they are sworn to support. Does any one imagine for a moment that they will be content with the simple disfranchisement of Catholics? Does any one suppose that after having mutilated the glorious charter of our liberties, after having robbed the Constitution of its brightest jewel, by the exclusion of one religious denomination from a participation in its blessings, that they will unite harmoniously upon any one system, as the true religion of the State? Will the different Protestant sects agree among themselves as to which one of them shall predominate, or whether all shall share in the enjoyment of rights which are denied to Catholics? Will the Atheists and the Infidels, the Debauchees and the Inebriates, the Politicians and the Demagogues be satisfied with any of them, without such a modification as will adapt them to their own peculiar views? For it must be remembered that these are the men who will be called upon to decide these grave questions of Christian doctrine. The subject has been, as it were, cast out from the pulpit, into the political arena. Religion has been made a political question; and those who elect Constables, Sheriffs, Members of Congress, and Governors of

States, must, likewise, when that issue comes up, settle the true form of Christian worship.

We cannot decide in advance, what particular form of faith would acquire the ascendancy; but the true Christian, who is not blinded by fanatical hatred, will have no difficulty in determining what would be the effect upon Christianity itself. The apparel of the inebriate who rolls in the gutter must be soiled; the morals of the virtuous, by an association with the vicious, must be contaminated: so, likewise, will the purity of the Christian religion be sullied by contact with political factions and legislative demagogues. If you would maintain that holy faith in the respect, and the love and the affections of mankind, you must confide it to the keeping of those only who at least profess to be its disciples.

The separation of religion from politics has long been advocated by the most eloquent apostles of liberty. This sentiment has often been enunciated in the past by those friends of freedom, who have sprung up amid the despotisms which have held mankind in the bonds of slavery. They could not illumine the darkness which over-clouded the minds of those who surrounded them, yet they afforded, nevertheless, lessons of instruction for posterity. Even in the midst of the madness which seized upon the French people, when they attempted to establish a new religion of state, we find evidence that by a few this important question was understood. When France had interdicted the Catholic worship, and the National Assembly was engaged in establishing a new form of worship out of the elements of those which had been destroyed, ANDRÉ CHENEER, who afterwards died upon the scaffold, addressed to that body a letter which embodied the only principle that could have saved the Republic from the ruin, disgrace and crimes which ended in its destruction, and in the re-establishment of despotism.

"The National Convention," said he, "has pretended to form a civil code of religion; that is to say, it had the idea of creating one priesthood after having destroyed another. Of what consequence is it to the State, that one religion differs from another? Is it for the National Assembly to re-unite the divided sects, and weigh all their differences? *Are politicians theologians?* We shall only be delivered from the influence of these men, when the National Assembly shall have maintained *for each the perfect liberty* of following whatsoever religion may please it; when every one shall pay for the worship he prefers to adopt, and pays for no other; and when the impartiality of tribunals, in such cases, shall punish alike the per-

secutors or the seditious of all forms of worship. The members of the National Assembly say, that the French people are not yet sufficiently ripe for this doctrine. We must reply to them—This may be, but it is for you to ripen us by your words, your acts, your laws. *Priests do not trouble States, when States do not disturb them.* Let us remember that eighteen centuries have seen all the Christian sects torn and bleeding from theological disputes and sacerdotal hatreds—always terminating by arming themselves with popular power."

Is there a true lover of liberty in this boasted land of Freedom, who can contemplate without a shudder, the consummation in practice of the theory upon which Know-Nothingism is predicated? Surely no member of that party possessed of ordinary reasoning faculties can suppose that they can successfully continue the existence of a party which advocates mere abstract doctrines that are never to be legally established. No political party can maintain any hold upon the sympathies of the people which bases its claims to support upon certain enumerated principles, and at the same time declares that those principles should not be carried into practice by legal enactments. The people will not follow leaders who tell them that all the measures they advocate are right in theory, but would be wrong in practice; that they must take an oath to support only such men as are in favor of a certain measure, but that the men thus placed in power are not expected to enact that measure into a law. It would be an injustice to honest believers in the doctrines of the Know Nothing party to suppose that their purpose is merely to seize upon or to gratify a popular antipathy of the people, for the sole purpose of attaining to political power, and I, therefore conclude that they mean what they say, and that they desire to establish their doctrines as the permanent policy of the Republic. Old Whigs, as well as all others who are devoted to the great principles of civil and religious liberty may well pause and ponder upon these things before irrevocably committing themselves to the support of such a party.

CHAPTER XI.

The Jacobin Clubs of France—Points of similarity between them and the Know-Nothing Clubs—Burning of the Ursuline Convent at Boston—The Elia Committee—Execution of Nuns in France—Riot, a consequence of Religious disputes—Know-Nothing oath to prescribe Whigs, who do not join the Order.—Whig principles differ altogether from those supported by Know-Nothings—Whigs must now decide upon their future course.

The following account of the origin of the Jacobin Clubs of France is from LAMARTINE'S History of the Girondists :

"The presentation by two members [of the Jacobins,] and an open scrutiny as to the character of the person proposed, were the conditions of admission : A set of rules, an office, a President, a Corresponding Committee, Secretaries, a Tribune and Orators, gave to these meetings all the forms of deliberative assemblies. Of all the passions of the people, their *hatred* was the most flattered. They made it auspicious, in order to subject it. The most eloquent in its eyes, was he who inspired it with the most dread—it had a parching, thirst for denunciations, and they were lavished on it with prodigal hand. This expression of opinion, thus organized into a permanent association at every point in the Empire, gave an electric shock which nothing could resist. All the Societies corresponded with one another and with the mother Society. It was the government or factions enfolded in their nets the government of the law ; but the law was mute and invisible, while faction was erect and eloquent. *It was the rule of fanaticism, preceding the Reign of Terror.* Thus was the Jacobin Club organized."

By the exercise of our reasoning faculties, we are often able to determine the effects that will follow from given causes, but we are more fully confirmed in such conclusions by a history of what have been the consequences flowing from similar causes in the past. Experience is, of all tutors, the most to be relied upon. History, which is the recorded experience of the past, is an ever-present monitor, by whose teachings it is the part of wisdom to be instructed.

The similarity between the Jacobin Clubs of France and the Know-Nothing Clubs of the United States, in many of their features, principles and objects, is apparent to any one familiar with their inception, their purposes and their history. Each had for its object the creation of a public opinion which would override and supersede the law—the erection of a power more potent than the Constitution. Each flattered *the passions* and especially *the hatred* of the people against certain classes and

sects. Each had a thirst for denunciation. Each encouraged and stimulated the fanaticism of good and worthy citizens, as well also as the fanaticism of Atheism and Infidelity, by proposing the proscription of Catholic citizens. The members of each were bound by the most solemn and imposing obligations to stand by each other in every emergency. And each, no doubt, contained within its bosom many good citizens, who, we must suppose, were actuated by pure and patriotic motives. It cannot be doubted that many members of the Know-Nothing party, through zeal for the form of worship which they regard as the purest emanation from the Bible, have attached themselves to that party in the hope of crippling the Catholic church in the United States. But in this they have most assuredly consulted their feelings, rather than their judgment. They have adopted a course which will be, of all others, the most effective means of increasing the moral strength and the numerical force of that church. Persecution has never yet made, and, unless man's nature changes, never will make, a real convert. The Jacobins deluged every plain and valley of beautiful France with the tears and blood of hundreds of thousands of Catholics--the country was converted into one great human slaughter-house--their churches were all closed, and worship was forbidden under pain of immediate death; and yet the Catholic church emerged from the ruin and is now the universally practiced worship of the French people. True Christians should learn that, in a Republic, the only effectual mode of combatting error is by an appeal to reason. The pulpit is the place from whence to disseminate true religion, and the Christian cause must suffer when it is mingled up with politics, and rests its defence with politicians and demagogues.

I am far from believing that it is the purpose of the Know-Nothing party to perpetrate the enormities which degraded the Jacobins of France. Neither was it the original design of the Jacobins to carry their hostility to the extreme of persecution which signalized their career; but the tendency of all religious controversies, when embittered by party animosities, is in that direction. In 1834, the anti-Catholic mob in Boston sacked the Ursuline Convent, and at a later period, in the same city, the Know-Nothing Hiss Committee, appointed by the Legislature of Massachusetts, was content with barely insulting the young girls in the nunnery. The American mob was satisfied with burning the building where the nuns resided, but the Jacobins shed the blood of the victims. One of these scenes is thus described by an eminent French historian. After detailing the incidents of one of the daily executions which signalized the Reign of Terror, the writer says:

"On the following morning the cars, still more numerous, started to the guillotine all the Nuns of the Abbey of Montmartre. The Abbess was Madame de Montmorency. Those poor females of every age, from tender youth even to grey hairs, thrown, while children, into the convents, had no crime to answer for but the will of their parents and fidelity to their religious vows. Grouped around their Abbess, they made the air resound with sacred chaunts on mounting the carts, and sang hymns even to the scaffold. As the Girondists had chaunted the hymn of their own death, so did these virgins sing, even to the last voice, the hymn of their martyrdom."—*Lamartine*.

It is unnecessary to trace farther the parallel between these two parties. It is to be hoped that no such brutality will mark the contentions of Christian sects in the United States, although in the riots and bloodshed, and bitterness and hatred, which have already attended the progress of the Know-Nothing party, good citizens have every reason to dread the effects which may flow from a continuance of this agitation. I know that this party has attempted to relieve itself from the responsibility of bloody riots at Louisville and elsewhere, by alleging that the foreign-born citizens and Roman Catholics commenced the assault. It is not at all necessary to my purpose, to decide upon this point; but I do say, and it will not be denied, that these deplorable results are the legitimate consequences which will ensue from the effort to enforce such doctrines as are advocated by the Know-Nothing party.

Without pausing here to dwell upon the impropriety of binding the members of a political party by solemn and fearful oaths, I desire especially to direct the attention of old Whigs, and others who are not members of the Order, as well as the rank and file of the Know-Nothing party, to one portion of the oath, which is exacted from its members, upon admission into its Councils.

"You promise and declare that you will support in all political matters, for all political offices, *the second degree members* of this Order, provided it be necessary for the American interests;" [*i. e.*, the interests of the American or Know-Nothing party.] * * * * * "And that you will ever seek the political advancement of those men who are good and true members of this Order."

With this oath staring us in the face, old Whigs are called upon by this party to rally around their standard, and aid in the elevation of their "second degree members" to all political offices; nay, more—they claim the support of Whigs on the score of duty, and previous party association, and denounce all such as will not submit to this outrageous insult as traitors.

Old Whigs are required to be "hewers of wood and drawers of water" for a party whose members have sworn that they will not in turn confer their support upon Whigs. Can it be true that the faithful old followers of CLAY, who have remained steadfast and true to their principles, have fallen so low that they can confer their support upon a party which withhold from them their birthright of freedom and equality? Have the old Whig hosts, whose banners and flags once waving so proudly in every valley, and on every hill and mountain-top throughout the length and breadth of the Republic, so fallen from their high estate, that they are content to figure in the train of men who declare, in effect, upon their oaths, that old Whigs are unworthy to hold office? And you, too—the "rank and file," the first degree members of the Order—are you content with the position of inferiority assigned to you? Are you satisfied to be regarded as the plebeians of their party, who are not entitled to any of the rewards or the offices, but whose single duty it is to elevate by your suffrages the second degree members of the Order?

It is needless to comment further upon the oath to which I have referred. Let old Whigs, and all others who have not attained to the dignity of the second degree, read and consider it well in all its bearings; and if they, after such an examination, conclude to support the candidates of the Know-Nothing party, I would say to them frankly, and in all kindness, "Go take the oaths necessary to constitute you a second degree member of the Know-Nothing Order; and although you thereby surrender your personal freedom of thought and action into the keeping of an irresponsible majority of the Council, you will be, at least, in theory, the equal of those on whom you confer your support."

I have thus, in the last three numbers of these "Reflections and Suggestions," considered a few of the most prominent objections to the policy, principles, and tendencies of the Know-Nothing party. I have stated them fairly and frankly, and with no feeling of personal unkindness against those who differ with me in opinion. I feel fully assured that no old line Whig can discover the slightest resemblance in the political faith of the two parties. On the contrary, they differ in all their aims and objects; they differ in the measures they propose, and in the principles which lie at their foundations; they differ in spirit, theory and practice; they differ in every thing: they have nothing in common. I feel and know that old CLAY Whigs will coincide with me in this opinion, whatever may be their present party attitude. I am satisfied that many an honest old Whig has felt in the very depths of his heart the truth of every

word I have uttered, who still lingers in the train of Know-Nothingism, loth to separate himself from old party associates. But the time has come when longer hesitation becomes a crime against patriotism. Our delay has exhibited our attachment to our old party. Let our action, now, manifest our devotion to our country.

CHAPTER XII.

No mere names should be received as a substitute for principles—Respect entertained for Mr. Fillmore—His opinions on the subject of Abolitionism—No man is a sufficient Platform of principles for genuine Republicans—Is Donelson to be trusted by Whigs?—His insult to the Whig party—Importance of the office of Vice President, as illustrated by the death of Harrison and Taylor.

Are the names of Messrs. FILLMORE and DONELSON a sufficient platform for old Whigs to stand upon, in the present important crisis in the affairs of the Republic? Never before has the country been called on to decide upon such important and grave questions. It is admitted by all parties, that the result of the next Presidential election will be more fruitful of good or evil, than any that has preceded it during the present generation. The issues involved, I have already discussed; and in view of their magnitude, I will make my interrogatory broader, and ask, *Is any living man platform enough for the patriotic and conservative Whig party?* There was a time, in the palmy and glorious days of its former greatness, when such a question would have been regarded as an insult by the humblest follower of the party, but now, in this period of our humiliation, we must submit without a murmur to the implied degradation. I cannot doubt, however, for a single moment, what would be the response of all in whose bosoms burn a spark of the old Whig fire, if they give voice to the feelings of their hearts. Never yet has a candidate for the Presidency been presented for our suffrage, who was regarded as "plat-

form enough," without a full and free declaration of principles by the party presenting him. Even Mr. CLAY, the great head and acknowledged leader of the Whig party, never came before the people, without a full and distinct understanding between him and his supporters upon all questions which agitated the public mind.

The blood of a BOURBON, or a BONAPARTE, or a scion of the Royal House of Hapsburg, may be sufficient platform for the subjects of a monarchy; but in a free government like ours, no *man* is platform enough to command the confidence and support of the people; and old Whigs will have to forget all the teachings of the old leaders, before they can abandon principles for the sake of any man. I do not mean to convey the idea of any disrespect towards Mr. FILLMORE, the candidate, who, in the absence of a frank and free declaration of principles on the part of his supporters, is presented as, of himself, "platform enough" for his party. I have no disposition to avoid the expression of regard and esteem for this distinguished statesman. There are important acts of his administration as President, which meet my unqualified approbation; but, notwithstanding this, his antecedents are not of such a character as to leave no shade of doubt as to his opinions upon important subjects. Grave questions have arisen since the completion of his Presidential term, and Abolition, although strong then, is now "wrestling with the government for its very existence." The unretracted opinions expressed by him upon this subject, must leave a painful uncertainty upon the minds of Southern people, in view of the admitted Abolitionism of the Know-Nothing party in the North, as evidenced in their National Convention. Old Whigs would, no doubt, be willing to confide in Mr. FILLMORE, if he had been nominated by an old-fashioned Whig convention, upon old-fashioned Whig principles; but the time selected to place him before the American people, on the sole platform of his political antecedents, is certainly inopportune, in view of the following expression of opinion on the great questions of the day:

BUFFALO, October 17, 1858.

SIR:—Your communication of the 15th inst., as Chairman of a Committee appointed by "The Anti-Slavery Society of the County of Erie," has just come to hand. You solicit my answer to the following interrogatories:

1st. Do you believe that petitions to Congress on the subject of Slavery and the Slave Trade ought to be received, read and respectfully considered by the representatives of the people?

2d. Are you opposed to the annexation of Texas to this Union, under any circumstances, so long as slaves are held therein?

3d. Are you in favor of Congress exercising all the Constitutional power it possesses, to abolish the internal Slave Trade between States?

4th. Are you in favor of immediate legislation for the abolition of Slavery in the District of Columbia?

I am much engaged and have no time to enter into an argument, or to explain at length my reasons for my opinion. I shall, therefore, content myself for the present, by answering ALL your interrogatories in the AFFIRMATIVE, and leave for some future occasion a more extended discussion on the subject.

* * * * *

MILLARD FILLMORE.

Since the days of WASHINGTON, no candidate for the Presidency has been regarded as so far above the people, and the frailties and faults of human nature, as to be deemed, of himself, a sufficient platform of principles, for his supporters. JEFFERSON, MADISON, MONROE, JACKSON, and CLAY, all came before the people as the representatives of certain enumerated and well-defined doctrines. Now, I would ask, is Mr. FILLMORE so far elevated above these shining beacon-lights in the past history of the Republic, or are the adherents of the old Whig party so far degraded below the people of other days, that they must make a platform of the man, instead of his measures and principles? However exalted may be our regard for Mr. FILLMORE, or however humble we may consider the old Whig party, an emphatic negative must be the response of every true-hearted and patriotic old Whig. But if Mr. FILLMORE, with all the respect and attachment which we entertain for him, on account of old party associations, is not, of himself, a sufficient platform for old Whigs, how much smaller is the title of A. J. DONELSON to this undoubting confidence on the part of our old party! The candidate for the Vice Presidency, is a man between whom and Whigs there has never been any political affinities. He is a recent deserter from the Democratic party, professing still to entertain all his former Democratic opinions, and that he has only added to his creed the peculiar tenets of the Know-Nothing party. Nay more! In his letter accepting the nomination of the Convention, he, while announcing his desertion of the Democratic party, adopts the slang and stereotyped terms of detraction in common use among certain leaders of the Know-Nothings; and in the very midst of the act consummating his treason, pauses to bestow a kick

upon the lifeless remains of his old antagonist, the Whig party, Read what he says in his Tulip Grove letter of acceptance:

"OUR LEADING IDEA IS, *that the two old parties, Democratic AND WHIG, have ceased to exert their former healthful influence, in the management of the public interest, and that without the intervention of reforms, which THEY CAN NEVER EFFECT, the beloved Constitution and Union, bequeathed to us by our forefathers, WILL NOT LONG BE PRESERVED!!*"

We thus find the candidate for the Vice Presidency so thoroughly imbued with the spirit of unkindness towards the old Whig party, that he restores its vitality for the moment—assures us that it is still living and vigorous, but that it has ceased to exert a healthful influence, and that unless he can introduce some reform, the Whig and Democratic parties, together, will destroy the "beloved Constitution bequeathed to us by our forefathers!!" He has in this assault upon the Whig party imitated the ambitious but recreant soldier, who arriving *too late* upon the battle-field, to take the life of an enemy, propped up a dead body, that he might have the gratification of knocking it down again. Maj. DONELSON contents himself with the utterance of vague charges, and fails to tell us what principles or measures of the Whig party are so dangerous to the perpetuity of our "beloved Constitution and Union." Like the National Know-Nothing Convention, and the leaders of that party generally, he combines in the same category the Whig and Democratic parties; and although they assume that the principles of both are inimical to the interest of the country, they yet claim the support of old Whigs, under the penalty of impeachment for high treason!

Now, without meaning any disrespect to Major DONELSON or his supporters, but as an old Whig, and in the name of the old Whig party, who are called upon to give him their support for the exalted station of Vice President of the United States, I would ask whether it is Major DONELSON, the Democrat—Major DONELSON, the deserter—Major DONELSON, the recently converted Know-Nothing—or Major DONELSON, the present reviler of the old Whig party—either or all—which constitute a "platform of principles" that entitles him to the confidence of old Whigs? The country will bear in mind that the office sought for by Major DONELSON is scarcely less important than that of the Presidency itself. Only twice in the history of the Whig party has it succeeded in its Presidential contests, and upon both occasions, at a very early period in their administrations, their Presidents were taken away by the hand of death, and the Vice Presidents occupied the vacated stations, and complet-

ed their terms of office. If old Whigs find nothing in the antecedents of the Know-Nothing candidate for the Vice Presidency, which commend him to their support, they will see less in his recent conversion, and in his gratuitous assaults upon the old Whig party, to strengthen their attachment to his person, or to establish their confidence in his principles or his reliability as a man and as a politician.

In brief, then, the Know-Nothing leaders demand of the members of the old Whig party, that they accept Messrs. FILLMORE and DONELSON as their "platform of principles;" that they give their support to candidates for office, who are sworn to "seek the political advancement of members of the Know-Nothing order," and of course to the exclusion of all Whigs, who have not taken the oaths; that they support a candidate who, in taking his position with his new associates, travels out of his sphere to bestow a buffet upon the old Whig party; and above all, that they throw the weight of their influence in favor of candidates who, even if successful in Tennessee, can only accomplish a division in the South, and a diversion in favor of Black Republicanism, which may be fatal to the rights of the South, and to the perpetuity of the Union. Old line Whigs may have been taught some humility in the school of misfortune; yet we cannot suppose that their old spirit is so thoroughly broken, as to accept the candidates of the Know-Nothing party as an all-sufficient platform of principles.

CHAPTER XIII.

Example of Henry Clay—Abolitionism the great question of the day—The American party in the North entirely Abolitionized—Six reasons why old line Whigs cannot support the Know-Nothings—Reasons for their union with the National party—Commanding position of the old Whig party in the present emergency.

"Holding the principle that a citizen, *as long as a single pulsation remains, is under an obligation to exert his utmost energies in the service of his country, whether in private or public station, my friends here and every where, may rest assured that in either condition, I shall stand erect, with a spirit unconquered, whilst life endures, ready to second their exertions in the cause of liberty the Union and the national prosperity.*" * * *

Whenever the Whig party shall become merged into a miserable sectional Abolition party, I will renounce it forever, *and in the future act with that party, REGARDLESS OF ITS NAME, which stands by the CONSTITUTION and the UNION!*"—HENRY CLAY.

In concluding the series of "Reflections and Suggestions on the Present State of Parties," which have already been extended to a much greater length than was embraced in the original scope of my design, I am fully aware that I have not done full justice to the important subjects which I have been called upon to consider. Every reader will agree, however, that I have not indulged discourteous or offensive allusions to those whose positions I have found it necessary to controvert, and that I have founded my arguments only upon undeniable and admitted truths. I have considered the subjects in controversy fairly, frankly, and certainly without any prejudice against those with whom I have been so long politically associated, but who upon these subjects entertain opinions different from my own. I cannot for one moment doubt that the conclusions which I have drawn from these facts will coincide in every important particular with the views and opinions of all whigs who cherish in their breasts an attachment for their old party. After a calm and considerate survey of all the questions at issue pertaining to the approaching struggle for the Presidency, it must be conceded by enlightened observers of passing events that ABOLITIONISM is "*the great, live, practical issue*" which, if it does not entirely absorb, certainly overrides by the vastness of the interests involved in its discussion, all other questions now before the American people. It is a hideous monster which "*is wrestling with the government for its very life*"; and, however anxious we may be to avoid or postpone the conflict, "*it can no longer be ignored.*" It has already mastered the popular branch of our National Legislature; and if, by heartless party antipathies in the South, it should be enabled to seize upon the Chief Executive Office of the nation, we may at once prepare for a dissolution of the Union, or to submit our necks to a more intolerable yoke of bondage than that which is now worn by our own slaves.

Prominent adherents of that party have told us, even upon the floor of Congress, that they would hail the "uprising of the slaves in the South, the assassination of the whites, and the pollution of their hearthstones, as the dawning of a political millenium." Their more sagacious leaders, however, pretend that they only desire to absorb for their own use the Territories of the United States, and to prohibit the Southern people from all participation therein. Presumptuous as is this claim

to superiority, the disguise is too thin to mask the actual purpose which they hope to accomplish. Like the anaconda enfolding its victim, they design to encircle us by our enemies, and then to crush us in their serpent-folds. If this party founded its pretensions upon any principle of honesty, decency, or necessity, we might hope, even at the last moment preceding the consummation of its purposes, in view of the calamitous consequences that must ensue from their triumph, that they might be induced to retrace their steps. But the principles of Abolitionism have their foundations in "envy, hatred, malice and all uncharitableness," and fanaticism is the mere instrument used to conceal these bad passions, under a show of piety and religion. There is no hope of conciliating its animosity.

In the Northern States, where Abolitionism finds its only adherents, it is confessedly true that its only antagonist is the national Democratic party. The American or Know Nothing party is as thoroughly Abolitionized in the free State, as the Black-Republicans themselves. In proof of this fact, I need only adduce the unanimity with which, in the election for Speaker, they united upon BANKS—in the undisguised spirit of aggression upon Southern rights, which signalized the proceedings of their National Convention at Philadelphia, and (beyond the limits of Philadelphia and New York) the universal demonstration of Abolition proclivities among the adherents and supporters of that party. Old Whigs who are guided by the great conservative and national principles which they have always claimed to be the distinctive characteristics of their party, cannot support the candidates of the Know-Nothing or American party.

1st. Because by voting for FILLMORE and DONELSON they divide the strength of the national forces, which should be arrayed in solid column against the Black Republicans.

2d. Because the Know-Nothing candidates can only be elected by attracting to their support the Abolition Americans of the North; and, therefore, the success of that ticket would be virtually a defeat of the national party, and a triumph of Abolitionism.

3d. Because the measures and principles of the Know-Nothing party are directly in conflict with the fundamental doctrines of free government, and with that freedom of conscience in questions of religious faith, which is the dearest inheritance bequeathed to us by our republican ancestors.

4th. Because secret political societies, the members of which are bound together by solemn oaths, are immoral in their tendency, dangerous to liberty, inconsistent with the spirit of re-

publicanism, and unnecessary in a free country, where every citizen has a right to express his opinions upon political subjects, without let or hindrance.

5th. Because all their political principles and practices are at war with the principles and practices of the Whig party, which they repudiate and condemn.

6th. Because true Whigs cannot, in the exercise of a proper degree of self-respect, support the candidates of a party, the members of which, under the solemnities of oaths, have virtually bound themselves to exclude all Whigs who have not taken upon themselves similar oaths, from the honors and emoluments of office in the Republic.

These insuperable objections to a union of old line Whigs with the American or Know-Nothing party conceded, they have only one of two alternatives left; either to remain inactive spectators of the conflict between the sectional Abolition party of the North, and the national Democratic party of the Union, or to assume a position in which their influence may save the country from the portentous evils by which it is menaced. As Whigs, we owe no allegiance to any party, and least of all to that one, which, by its defection, accomplished the destruction of our party and whose leaders ingloriously beg to be released from their portion of responsibility to the country, for what they term its obnoxious acts and violated pledges.

Never before in the history of the Republic, has any party occupied a position in which it could accomplish more for its own fame and the general good of the country, than can the old line Whigs in the present conflict, by a rigid adherence to the course of policy indicated by the antecedents of their past history. To effect a re-organization now, with a view to separate and independent action in the approaching struggle, is not only at this late period impracticable; but if it were possible, it could accomplish no practical results. In this contest, we must of necessity take our position with one or the other of the organized parties; but in doing so, we incur no obligation whatever to abstain, *either now or hereafter*, from a reconstruction of our own party, if we should regard it either necessary or desirable.

While, therefore, the importance of the interests involved in the issue, enforces upon old line Whigs the necessity of participating actively in the important political events that are transpiring, and while it is impossible for them to co-operate with the Know-Nothing party, without an entire abandonment of their cherished principles, and a disregard to the teachings and to the illustrious example of their great leader, CLAY, we

cannot close our eyes to the incontestible fact, *that there is not one question that has hitherto divided the old Whig and Democratic parties, which enters into the present contest.* And further, that, *upon every issue involved in the approaching Presidential struggle, there is an entire coincidence and agreement between the old line Whigs and the Democratic party.* After long years of estrangement upon questions of mere governmental policy, a common danger has re-united the patriotic, conservative and national elements of both parties upon a common platform.

There has been a time in the past, when the Whig party, by the magnitude of its proportions, the brilliancy of its struggles, and the greatness of its leaders, has presented to the world a more imposing spectacle, but never before has there occurred an emergency, when, by a single patriotic and spontaneous effort, its still faithful supporters could accomplish so much for its own permanent glory, and for the welfare and happiness of the Republic.

The old Whig party, as an organized body, no longer exists; it has perished at the hands of those in whom it most trusted; it has fallen by the treachery of pretended friends; but let not its ~~Existence~~ be written until it may be recorded, that in the great struggle between the Nation and the sectional and sectarian Factions, which menaced its integrity, the last expiring efforts of its disbanded, but still patriotic adherents, were directed to the preservation of the Union, without concessions, and the Constitution, without mutilation.

Then,

“— while the tree
Of freedom's withered trunk puts forth a leaf,
Even for its tomb, a garland it will be.”

APPENDIX.

The Nashville *Gazette* propounds to "an Old Clay Whig" the following interrogatories, to which I most cheerfully respond :

"Will you or will you not vote for any candidate for the next Presidency who is, and has always been opposed to the old Clay Whig party ?

Will you now, and hereafter, identify yourself with a party which does now and has always heretofore opposed the principles and policy of the old Clay Whig party !"

ANSWER.

Old line Whigs, who seek to regulate their course in the approaching contest for the Presidency upon *mere party names*, and the antecedents of the candidates as *mere partisan leaders*, would, of course, abstain from all participation in the contest for the Presidency, for the reason that all the parties now before the people either have in the past, or do at present, occupy a position adverse to the Whig party. But if we regard *principles* as our guide, the question as to which of the two to choose, is one of easy solution.

On the one hand we find the National Democratic party, against whom, it is true, the old Whig party once contended on the now settled and obsolete questions of land distribution, bank and tariff, ready for the struggle on a programme of principles, which commends itself to the patriotic regard of all true friends of liberty.

The competitor of this party for public favor in Tennessee, is the American or Know-Nothing party, to which the *Gazette* belongs. This party recognises as its great leader in the South, ANDREW JACKSON DONELSON, who has but recently abandoned the Democratic party, for the reason, as he alleges, that the Democracy has abandoned *its old principles* ! !

Mr. DONELSON does not, according to his own showing, leave the Democratic party, because *his own opinions have undergone a change*, but because DEMOCRACY HAS CHANGED ! ! If old fashioned Van Buren Democracy was now in vogue, he would still be (if we are to credit his own declaration) a worshipper at the Democratic altar. But farther, Mr. DONELSON most clearly means to intimate, in his Tulip Grove letter of acceptance, that the Democratic party, in abandoning its principles, has really gone over to the Old Whigs, and that this is substantially the reason of his late political migration. He proclaims in that letter, that "*the beloved Constitution and Union, bequeathed to us by our forefathers, will not long be preserved, without the inter-*

vention of reforms, which the Democratic and Whig parties can never effect." Is it true, as intimated by the candidate for the Vice Presidency, that the old Whig and Democratic parties, under the pressure of present political questions, now stand upon the same platform? This being conceded, would it not be most unwise, unpatriotic, and inconsistent for old Whigs to refuse to co-operate with the Democratic party, at a time when there is a complete identity of opinion between them, upon all the questions now in controversy? And would not that inconsistency amount to the extreme of folly, if old Clay Whigs, for the gratification of old unkindnesses against the Democratic party, should throw themselves into the embrace of ANDREW J. DONELSON, who boasts that he is still a good Van Buren Democrat,—that he left the Democratic party because it had abandoned its former principles—and that he still entertains all his old feelings of aversion to the old Whig party!

It is clear, then, that if the old Clay Whigs take part in the next Presidential election, they have no alternative but to choose between two candidates, both claiming to have been opposed to the old Clay Whig party. If it be the purpose of the *Gazette* to elicit from me an answer as to which of these two tickets I will support, I have no hesitation in expressing my preference for the National Democratic candidate over the professedly sectarian Democrat, A. J. DONELSON, connected even with the name of MILLARD FILLMORE.

In reply to the second interrogatory, I will be equally frank and explicit. Believing, as I sincerely do, that the American or Know-Nothing party "does now and has always heretofore opposed the principles and policy of the old Clay Whig party;" and knowing that its leaders profess in their platform of principles, that this party was "*founded upon the ruins and in spite of the opposition of the old Whig party,*" I am free to declare that I will not now, nor do I think I ever will, identify myself with its political fortunes.

But superadded to my disinclination to Know-Nothingism, on account of its attitude of antagonism to the old Whig party, I have another objection to it, which renders it peculiarly repugnant to Southern and National Whigs, who regard the preservation and perpetuity of the equal rights of the South, as of paramount importance.

That the Know-Nothing party in Congress, from the Northern States, and in fact the entire party beyond the limits of the Slave States, is thoroughly Abolitionized, no candid man can deny. But will it be said that Southern Know-Nothings are sound upon this question, and that they cannot be held responsible for the opinions of their Northern allies upon collateral

issues? Unfortunately, even this plea will avail them nothing; for both the *Gazette* and the *Nashville Banner*, urgently demanded the expurgation of the Slavery test in the Know-Nothing platform, with the view of course of combining all the Abolition elements of the North against the National Democratic candidates. The *Banner* has, for months past, pursued a systematic course of detraction and abuse of nearly all the leading men in the North, who have espoused the cause of the South. The opinions of PIERCE, DOUGLAS, CASS, BUCHANAN, and other devoted friends and supporters of the Constitutional rights of the South, are condemned in terms which would seem to indicate a settled hostility to all Northern men, who dare to raise a voice in our defence. The *Banner* even went to the extreme length of declaring, in effect, that the opinions of the Black Republican "nigger worshipper" CAMPBELL more nearly coincided with those entertained by that paper, than the bold, noble, manly, and patriotic sentiments of that gallant defender of Southern rights—STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS.

The *Banner* has the sagacity to perceive that unless the Know-Nothing party in the South can conciliate the Abolitionists of the North, its defeat is inevitable. Now, I appeal to all patriotic men of the South, no matter what may be their party preferences, and I submit the question to their consciences, whether a party victory would not be purchased at too high a price, that should be secured by such an unhallowed combination! To be more direct and specific, I submit for the consideration of those to whom the above question is propounded, the following extract from an article which appeared in the editorial columns of the *Nashville Banner*, on the 20th inst., copied, without dissent, from the *Pennsylvania Enquirer*. It is, as the reader will perceive, a full exposition of the "ignoring" policy so long advocated by the *Banner*, and shows clearly what is meant by those Southern editors who have proposed to strike out all the features of their political creed which conflict with the sentiments, or prejudices, of Black Republicanism. The article in question, after canvassing the chances of different Democratic aspirants, before the Cincinnati Convention, concludes thus:—

"Indeed, the next presidential election is involved in utter obscurity. Thus far there is but a single candidate in the field, viz: Mr. FILLMORE. Nevertheless, four more Conventions are still to be held, one by the Democrats, at Cincinnati; one by the Republicans, at Philadelphia; one by the Whigs, at Louisville; and one by the seceding Americans, at New York. Should all these take up distinct candidates, there will be no less than five tickets presented to the public. That the sense

of the country is against the policy of the National Administration we have no doubt ; BUT THE DIFFICULTY, under the circumstances described, IS TO HARMONIZE THE OPPOSITION upon some broad and comprehensive platform. IS IT NOT POSSIBLE TO DO THIS YET?"

The entire policy of the *Banner*, as illustrated in its columns during the last few months, clearly indicates the character of the concessions it would be willing to make, in order to "harmonize all the elements of opposition" to the National Administration; but I do not believe that the patriotic old Whigs, either North or South, will consent to stand upon that "broad and comprehensive platform," which would unite them in political fellowship with Black Republican Abolitionists.

It may be that the *Banner* and *Enquirer* suppose that it is possible, even yet, to accomplish this unholy combination of jarring and discordant elements ; but for one, I believe that the mere announcement of such a purpose, especially in the South, will secure its defeat. There is a conservative and patriotic sentiment pervading the masses of all political parties in Tennessee, which would reject with horror any attempt to make them parties to such a compact as is shadowed forth in the foregoing extract in the columns of the *Banner*. And it can not be doubted that the intimation of such a design will arouse patriotic citizens of the South to the necessity of a more united opposition to the insidious encroachments of Black Republicanism.

Having thus shown where I and other old Clay Whigs do not stand, it is proper to state explicitly what position we do occupy, in reference to the political question and parties involved in the Presidential contest. In common with the Democratic party, we stand upon a platform of principles, of which the following are the leading features : The maintenance of the constitutional rights of the South, and opposition to all further compromises with, or concessions to, Abolitionism ; the perpetuation of the constitutional right of every citizen to worship the Almighty, according to the dictates of his own conscience ; security and freedom to all who can justly claim the privileges of citizenship under the laws, and opposition to oath-bound political associations. The opinions of the *Gazette*, of course, differ materially from the views here enunciated ; but I defy any one to point out a single article in that creed, which is in conflict with any principle that has ever been maintained by any one having a just claim to the appellation of "An Old Clay Whig."

Since the foregoing was put to press, the Great National Democratic party, have through their delegates, assembled in Convention at Cincinnati, unanimously presented for the support of the American people, the name of

JAMES BUCHANAN,

of Pennsylvania, for President, and

JOHN C. BRACKENRIDGE,

of Kentucky, for Vice President.

These nominations cannot fail at once to fix the determination of those Old Whigs who have been awaiting the result of the deliberations of that convention before deciding as to their future course. In the galaxy of brilliant names which have acquired renown in our great Republic, no others could be selected who would be more acceptable to the mass of the old conservative Whigs, or to the great Democratic party which claims JAMES BUCHANAN, as one of its purest, ablest, and most distinguished champions.

Of JOHN C. BRACKENRIDGE, it is only necessary to say that he combines, all the elements, of the orator, the patriot, and the statesmen, and that upon the occurrence of any contingency, which might place him at the head of the government as its chief executive officer, every citizen of the Republic, would feel that the country would be safe.

But it is not alone the eminent fitness of these gifted and distinguished citizens, for the exalted stations to which the conservative party of the Union desires to elevate them, which commend them to the hearty support of patriotic old Whigs; but, also the *eminently National and Constitutional platform upon which they stand*, cannot fail to attract to their support the conservative elements of all the political organizations, North and South, which have divided the country. The principles embodied in that declaration of political faith, are such as can be cordially maintained, in every portion of the confederacy. New Hampshire and South Carolina, Maine and Louisiana, Massachusetts and Georgia, may all stand together upon that broad and solid platform, without any abandonment of principles, or concession of rights on the part of either. It is a platform, which was adopted with enthusiasm, in the Convention, without amendment or alteration, *by the unanimous voice of every State, and of every delegate.* Old line Whigs, as Whigs or patriots, will discover no sentiment or principle bearing upon the great and exciting questions that now agitate the Republic, which differ in the smallest degree from those which they

have always maintained under the leadership of HENRY CLAY, and the other great shining lights of the old Whig party. There is no evasion or subterfuge, or excess of verbiage, but all is clear, explicit, and to the point.

In conclusion, I ask old Whigs to compare the resolutions adopted by the Democratic Convention, on all the questions which enter into the present struggle, (and which are hereto subjoined,) with the sectional, sectarian, proscriptive, and anti-Republican platforms, upon which the opponents of the National party now stand :

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION AT CINCINNATI, JUNE, 1856.

Resolved. That the foundation of this Union of States having been laid in, and its prosperity and pre eminent example in free government built upon, entire freedom in matters of religious concernment, and no respect of persons in regard to rank, or place of birth, no party can justly be deemed national, constitutional, or in accordance with American principles, which bases its exclusive organization upon religious opinions and accidental birth-place. And hence, a political crusade in the nineteenth century, and in the United States of America, against Catholics and foreign-born, is neither justified by the past history, or the future prospects of the country, nor in unison with the spirit of toleration and enlarged freedom which peculiarly distinguishes the American system of popular government.

Resolved, That we reiterate, with renewed energy of purpose, the well-considered declaration of former Conventions upon the sectional issues of Domestic Slavery, and concerning the reserved rights of the States—

1. That Congress has no power, under the Constitution, to interfere with or control the domestic institutions of the several States, and that such States are the sole and proper judges of everything appertaining to their own affairs, not prohibited by the Constitution ; that all efforts of the Abolitionists or others, made to induce Congress to interfere with questions of slavery, or to take incipient steps in relation thereto, are calculated to lead to the most alarming and dangerous consequences ; and that all such efforts have an inevitable tendency to diminish the happiness of the people, and endanger the stability and permanency of the Union, and ought not to be countenanced by any friend of our political institutions.

2. That the foregoing proposition covers, and was intended to embrace, the whole subject of slavery agitation in Congress,

and therefore, the Democratic party of the Union, standing on this national platform, will abide by and adhere to a faithful execution of the acts known as the Compromise measures, settled by the Congress of 1850, "the act for reclaiming fugitives from service or labor," included; which act being designed to carry out an express provision of the Constitution, cannot, with fidelity thereto, be repealed, or so changed as to destroy or impair its efficiency.

3. That the Democratic party will resist all attempts at renewing, in Congress or out of it, the agitation of the slavery question under whatever shape or color the attempt may be made.

4. That the Democratic party will faithfully abide by and uphold the principles laid down in the Kentucky and Virginia resolutions of 1798, and in the report of Mr. Madison to the Virginia Legislature, in 1800; that it adopts those principles as constituting one of the main foundations of its political creed, and is resolved to carry them out in their obvious meaning and import.

And that we may more distinctly meet the issue on which a sectional party, subsisting exclusively on slavery agitation, now relies to test the fidelity of the people, North and South, to the Constitution and the Union—

1. *Resolved*, That claiming fellowship with, and desiring the co-operation of all who regard the preservation of the Union under the Constitution as the paramount issue—and repudiating all sectional parties and platforms concerning domestic slavery, which seek to embroil the States and incite to treason and armed resistance to law in the Territories, and whose avowed purpose, if consummated, must end in civil war and disunion—the American Democracy recognize and adopt the principles contained in the organic laws establishing the Territories of Kansas and Nebraska as embodying the only sound and safe solution of the "slavery question," upon which the great national idea of the people of this whole country can repose in its determined conservatism of the Union—**NON-INTERFERENCE BY CONGRESS WITH SLAVERY IN THE TERRITORIES, OR IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.**

2 That this is the basis of the Compromise of 1850,—confirmed by both the Democratic and Whig parties in national Conventions—ratified by the people in the election of 1852,—and rightly applied to the organization of Territories in 1854.

3. That by the uniform application of this Democratic principle to the organization of new States; with or without domestic slavery, as they may elect—the equal rights of all the States will be preserved intact—the original compact of the

Constitution maintained inviolate—and the perpetuity and expansion of this Union insured to its utmost capacity of embracing, in peace and harmony, every future American State that may be constituted or annexed, with a Republican form of Government.

Resolved, That we recognize the right of the people of all the Territories, including Kansas and Nebraska, acting through the legally and fairly expressed will of a majority of actual residents, and whenever the number of their inhabitants justifies it, to form a Constitution, with or without domestic slavery, and be admitted into the Union upon terms of perfect equality with the other States.

Resolved, finally, That in view of the condition of popular institutions of the Old World (and the dangerous tendencies of sectional agitation, combined with the attempt to enforce civil and religious disabilities against the rights of acquiring and enjoying citizenship, in our own land) a high and sacred duty is devolved with increased responsibility upon the Democratic party of this country, as the party of the Union, to uphold and maintain the rights of every State, and thereby the Union of the States; and to sustain and advance among us constitutional liberty, by continuing to resist all monopolies and exclusive legislation for the benefit of the few at the expense of the many, and by a vigilant and constant adherence to those principles and compromises of the Constitution, which are broad enough and strong enough to embrace and uphold the Union as it was, the Union as it is, and the Union as it shall be, in the full expression of the energies and capacity of this great and progressive people.

[The text in this block is extremely faint and illegible, appearing as a series of horizontal lines.]



3 2044 004 778 569

